

Direct Democracy and the Nature of God

4th Edition

Alex Romane

© 2017

This 4th edition was prompted after further learning acquired from female Islamic scholars [I know, they're not allowed]. I have since come to learn that my belief that Islamic armies ONLY initially invaded foreign lands in revenge for invasions into Islamic lands, was historically inaccurate.

To summarise; I now believe that the Jewish Crusaders reacted to Islamic incursions into non-Islamic lands that were launched by Islam's prophet for political self-gain ONLY and, I believe that Mecca was stolen [through the forceful use of violence] from the Jews by Islam's prophet.

However, I have never been afraid of being wrong because I am searching only for a universal truth [as opposed to my own truth] and as such, I have nothing to hide, and no hidden agenda.

Therefore, I have NOT omitted any references to my former inaccurate related beliefs about Islam's political history [such as this reference in Page 110; *"For the same reasons, if the Christian faith could apologise to the Islamic faith for launching the initial crusades into Muslim lands then again, we would all benefit."* and have instead simply decided to be honest about my mistake.

In alignment with this but drawn from my own independent research, I now also firmly believe that Islam's prophet was NOT searching for a universal truth, but was instead political and socially corrupt and, was also mentally unwell. I had already explained why I believe that this could have been the case by citing the example of him choosing a six year-old wife, when he was forty-two years of age.

Chapters

3. Introduction

13. How and why God has no needs
15. How we know that we have free will
18. Where does the Devil come from?
19. How and why the Devil was not an angel
23. The nature of Evil
71. How and why God doesn't desire that we fear God
72. How and why sin does not exist
77. Expanding our religions
82. Achieving unity and freedom
96. How and why God would desire that we question God
97. How and why it is okay by God, not to believe in God
99. How and why God won't ever judge us
102. How and why propaganda from our 'leaders' causes disunity
112. How and why violence solves nothing
113. Why there won't be a Second Coming
116. Why God won't ever punish us
119. How and why there is no Hell
122. How and why God does not test us with pain and suffering
125. How and why the books contradict the nature of God
127. How to see the truth of the books - not the propaganda of men
128. Heaven on Earth is already here
140. The creation of God
142. God is a product of nature - not the other way around
143. How nature and life have existed forever
146. Reincarnation, reading the future, the meaning of your name and spirit guides
153. How and why the future is up to us - not the prophets of doom

Introduction

As programmes that form a two-tier strategy of control, centralised partisan political systems seek to oppress true expression of the mind while religious systems seek to oppress true expression of the soul. Between them, they keep us separate from each other and separate from the truth of the nature of a God who created everything.

If [as the religions state] God existed before everything, then it is not possible for God to also have any needs. Without realising this obvious logic, the religions have produced whole books listing God's needs, requirements, and punishments if we disobey.

My message:

*If [as the religions state] God existed before everything then God has no needs,
If God has no needs then God is vulnerable to nothing,
If God is vulnerable to nothing then God can't be threatened by anything,
If God can't be threatened by anything then God has no purpose for laws,
If God has no purpose for laws then we have free will,
If we have free will then there is no punishment,
If there is no punishment then there is no Hell,
If there is no Hell then there is no evil or Devil.*

If you understand and agree with the logic above, you are now seeing how the religions and their books are inaccurate, contradictory and extremely deceitful about the nature of a God who created everything and therefore, also about what God wants from us.

If you understand and disagree with the logic above, I would be very interested to hear from you because if you disagree and can show me where and how, you would be the first to do so since I began inviting the religious to challenge it [in 2009] and, although no religious 'leader' or so-called 'scholar' has ever shown me how any aspect is illogical or 'incorrect', neither have they amended what they continue to preach and so, they are consciously exploiting their followers and the followers themselves allow this to happen simply because they refuse to question.

If you don't understand the logic above and if you would like further elaboration and explanation, please read this eBook and please do question everything in it, as I believe that ultimately, questioning it will be the only way for you to find the truth of my message which is simply that;

God loves ALL of us always, without conditions and regardless of our behaviour.

It is the religions themselves that confirm their inaccuracy and delusion regarding their understanding and perception of the nature of God because if as the religions state, God existed before everything, then God can not have any needs or requirements of anything in any way [contrary to the statements of every religious book]. With God having no needs, God has no vulnerabilities and if God has no vulnerabilities, God can not be threatened by anything and so God has no purpose for laws – meaning that 'sin' doesn't exist in the eyes of God.

With God having no needs or requirements and no laws to break, we have free will and God has no need to punish anything for any act [there is simply no purpose]. If God has a desire to punish when God has no need to punish, then how is this so-

called 'God' worthy of our recognition?

If God has just one need then whatever it is, it must have existed before God did [for God to be dependent upon it] but, this would mean that God didn't create everything. This is a point of logic and so, if you [as a follower of religion] continue to choose to empower what you have now seen is an illogical and contradictory doctrine that fears a 'God' who existed before everything yet who somehow also has needs and vulnerabilities, it will be because you consciously choose not to question the masculine-oriented religious conditioning that has consumed you [probably since birth] and if so, you make this choice in accordance with your fears but with a God who has no needs, you have nothing to fear, nothing to lose, and everything to gain.

If you still believe that a God who existed before everything would punish anything for a reason other than need, then you are choosing to follow the doctrine of a 'God' who punishes purely out of desire and, when humans inflict pain on others purely out of personal desire, we label them as psychopathic. Such a 'God' would have less compassion than most humans do because most humans only punish their children because they believe that they need to - not because they desire to. Logically speaking, it can therefore only be undiagnosed psychopaths or those who don't have the courage to question, who would willingly respect the doctrine of such an overtly psychopathic and tyrannical 'God'.

I believe that there is just:

- *Humans, other animals, plants and the elements*
- *Our mismanaged pain and its resulting expressed behaviour [what religions call evil]*
- *Guardian Angels [human souls who agree to reincarnate with us in spirit form]*
- *Nature Spirits [spirit form guardians of plants and animals]*
- *Discarnate post-death emotional fragments [what religions call evil spirits]*
- *God*
- *Heaven*

I believe that when humans and animals die, the body, soul and emotions separate into three entities. The body goes into the ground, the soul returns to God but the emotional fragments [what the religions call 'ghosts', 'demons' and 'evil' spirits] often get stuck in between [the Astral] where until healed with love and without persecution, they remain lost and fearful - seeking comfort in both human and animal hosts [what the religions call 'possession'].

It is the violent, aggressive, demanding, dispassionate, thoughtless, abusive, irresponsible, self-righteous, misguided, ego-oriented [and now trendy] act of the religious so-called 'exorcism' that actually interferes with the healing process of such entities and keeps them from being able to recycle because, such hurt and lost entities can ONLY be truly healed, blessed and cleared with courage, care and compassion [love] for both host and entity. I believe that we would also benefit if we were to treat abusive children in exactly the same way because, the more we reject and condemn such children [who are ALWAYS themselves victims of some form of abuse], the more hurt they will feel and the more abusively ['evil'] they will act.

The religions state that God has given us free will, yet say that if we choose a path that God does not desire for us to choose, that we will be punished by God. In this scenario, it may be true that we are free to choose but, this 'choice' has a condition attached so, either God manipulates and influences our ability to choose freely by use of a threat or again, the religions are lying to us about the nature of God.

Why does God need for Catholics and Muslims to breed with no regard for the planet's diminishing resources? Why does God need for young boys to be mutilated [circumcised] against their will [Judaism and Islam]? Why does God need for young

girls to have their clitoris mutilated so that they never experience the pleasure of sex but only the pain of labour - whilst the men remain intact [Christianity]? Isn't this simply legalised child abuse? Why does God need for only women to be covered [Islam]? Why does God need for a Muslim wife to be beaten and raped if she refuses her husband's sexual demands [Qur'an verse 4:34 being just one hint of this]? Is this really acceptable to Muslim women? Why does God need for Christian women to be enslaved into forced marriage through rape, or to be stoned to death if after her ordeal, she still refuses [Moses: Deuteronomy - Chapter 22]? Is this really acceptable to Christian women? If this behaviour is only of God's desire [and not out of need], then how is this a God of love and peace and, why is such a God worthy of respect? Of deeper concern is the question of what sort of person would worship a God of this nature - is such a God only actually worshipped by undiagnosed psychopaths and those who refuse to question?

If God created everything, then God does not need for any of this and so, it can only be the twisted, scared, and over-dressed men of religion who fear women and who seek to control others, who desire such ungodly behaviours.

If God has no needs then God's motives for anything can only be oriented in desire. If God desires to punish when humans do not, what sort of 'God' is this? If God's survival depends upon the thoughts and behaviours of humans, how is this an all-powerful God and more importantly, how did this 'God' ever exist before us - if at all?

I use aspects of classical science, quantum mechanics, human psychology and my own process of logic, reason and elimination to question the existence of evil, the Devil, Hell and sin, whilst acknowledging the existence of God and Heaven. I also attempt to show how the way that the religions perceive the nature of God is at the root of all of our social problems individually, collectively and globally.

This eBook is an elaboration of my thought process, that being;

If God requires nothing from us because God has no needs [God did exist before us or anything else and so will exist without us or anything else], why would God punish anyone for anything? If God does not need to punish us then why would God desire to? If it is for our atonement then why would God put us through 'Hell' to be worthy of forgiveness when God is all-forgiving anyway? Does God enjoy punishing? What sort of entity would enjoy inflicting pain upon anything for any reason and, why is such an entity worthy of our respect?

If we have free will and if God is all-merciful, then how are any of the religious books or their derivatives related to the word of God when their messages constantly conflict with the notion that God has no needs and therefore, that we have free will?

I explore the potential motives for the behaviours of both God and of the Devil so as to understand the individual natures of both God and the Devil and, the possible creation of both and, what was potentially happening before God was God. Is the Devil an actual entity or just a concept or metaphor?

This document is not anything other than my own thoughts, questions, research, opinions and conclusions summarised after years of specific questioning on the issue of the natures of both God and the Devil. It is neither wrong nor right but it is my truth according to my own perception, knowledge, and experience up to the time of writing this and, it is no more or no less divine than any other thought of yours or mine.

I believe that neither you nor myself need to be a qualified clergyman, scientist, scholar, teacher or philosopher or 'expert' of any kind to know the answers or to have questions about God in the first place because if we are from God and we have a question about God, then we are qualified.

Being qualified in the West actually amounts to nothing more than having a strong tendency to recall previously acquired information regarding specific subjects. Qualifications in the Western education system test not much more than memory-recall abilities and do not test actual overall intelligence, as this is something that can not be quantified. It can not be quantified because there will always be a limitless supply of information and creative mental resources and always something new to learn and if something is limitless, how do you know how much of it is too little or too much?

When we take questions to others who say that we are not ready for the answer, they may say this because they do not know the answer themselves and their ego will not allow them to share this with us. They may also tell us that as we are not 'qualified' we shouldn't question but, if we have a question then the answer will be working its way towards us so keep questioning and seeking and you shall find. God is with all of us all of the time and is talking with all of us all of the time so the real question is; are we listening?

Throughout my life, I have always assumed that when I can not hear or feel God, then it's not because God isn't there or isn't connected with me. It has always been my assumption and belief that it is me who isn't listening or, isn't re-cognising the difference between my thoughts and God's words because I always believed in God's existence [even if at first, a purely religious-oriented God].

This document is a compilation of many documents written over several decades and so was not written chronologically. I am not a writer or an author by profession [I have no desire to write further eBooks and not much style when it comes to the written word] and although I detail various events from my life in this eBook, it is not an autobiography. I have mentioned personal past experiences as and when relevant and splitting everything into chapters was done in an attempt to compile the various documents into one chronological document. It is hopefully also easy to use as a reference guide [hence the reiterations and repetitions throughout] and, although I will not apologise for causing any offence, no offence was intended.

I also state throughout how it is not possible for anyone to force us to do anything that we don't in some way also choose to do ourselves but, the exception to this principal is for anyone or anything that is not capable of consciously considering multiple choices in any given situation - such as vulnerable adults who [for whatever reason] may not be aware of all available choices, children, animals and plants and, I believe that this is also why these groups are regarded as vulnerable by our societies [even though they are rarely treated as such].

I never advocate the quality of any alternative choices in any given moment, just that there ARE choices - at worst, no one can stop you from choosing to suffocate yourself by swallowing your tongue, should suicide ever be a better option than choosing to endure any event.

I also write about this from the perspective of someone who believes in reincarnation and therefore, someone who believes that in choosing the life that we have after seeing it, that we have therefore chosen to experience all of its events [including our death] but, that we also have the ability through choice to change our life's events [meaning that I believe that life is a combination of both free will and destiny].

My aim is to show you a view of God and of the Devil that arises from questioning the sources of so-called 'divine' information and, by questioning what we can derive from our own experience as being the nature of God but firstly, I feel that it is really important to deal with a few specific common inaccurate perceptions:

Facts - there are no such things;

Is it a fact that the glass is half full or half empty? Is a mouse in fact, a large or a small animal? Would the answer be different if you put this question to an ant? How can it be a fact that the glass is both half full and half empty at the same time, when both conditions are the extreme opposites of each other? How can it be a fact that the mouse is both small and large at the same time?

It is possible because all facts are merely personal individual opinions based largely upon how we are looking at something. How we perceive something is just as much influenced by individual internal factors as it is by the external 'reality' of what we are actually observing [a process of projection].

The concept of facts being tangible is so embedded into our cultural thinking that to not believe in them would be crazy. We use them in conversation, in corporate marketing, in politics and in courts of law to convict or acquit. The irony is that it has for years been a central part of legal training for solicitors and barristers to be taught of how there are no such things as facts, only perceived facts. Wouldn't it have been nice if any of these socially responsible people had cared to share this with the rest of us - whilst they pass judgement based upon the 'facts'?

Everything that we believe we know is actually just a belief based upon a belief, based upon a belief. Choose a colour - and see that although you have always been told that this colour is the colour that you see it as, no one has ever proved to you that it is actually this colour. For example; we all 'know' that grass is green but, no one has ever proved to us that grass is green - it is simply a shared belief based upon other beliefs.

Wrong and Right/Good and Bad/Big and Small - there are no such things;

These and other descriptive terms are also simply opinions oriented in perceptions that shift from time to time, place to place and culture to culture and so they are relative to other aspects - they are not tangible universal 'facts'.

In some cultures it is ethically and legally wrong to do things that in another culture would only be seen as right. If one culture is wrong and the other is right, who is to say which of the two is right? Who would be the arbitrator? Who would decide and pass judgement? Who is to say if another person would be wrong or right?

If the concepts of wrong and right do exist, where do we get the guide for what is wrong and what is right? If it was to be from another human then what would qualify this human to pass judgement and oppress the free will of others? If The Wrong and Right Guide comes from God, then where is the guide for those who don't believe in God? Are people who don't believe in God not entitled to have a sense of wrong from right? Are people who don't believe in God incapable of developing and exercising a sense of wrong and right? Are we saying that only people of religion are capable and 'righteous' in deciding what's wrong and right for the rest of us - letting them force their opinions onto others through common law? Is this not religious oppression?

Don't the religions use common law to control others by enforcing their own ideas of wrong and right not just onto their followers, but also onto the followers of other faiths as well as those who don't even believe in a God?

As well as being highly demonstrative of the relationship between common law and religion, isn't having to be married to the mother of your child just to be recognised by common law as a father also not religious oppression?

Approximately 33% of all UK schools are either a church or a religious house/faith school [funded by the taxpayer and not by the church], yet we give the church the power to shape how our children perceive each other and the world? Is this not also a major factor in the spreading of mindless indoctrination that is ever more in conflict with science and history?

Until recently and in the UK, a shopkeeper of any faith or of no faith who traded on a Sunday would be breaking common law. His or her free will would be compromised and they would be punished [in accordance with Christian-oriented common law] - even though the books of the religions all state that God has given free will to all.

Quite often, our opinions and ideas of wrong and right are no more than inherited opinions [not facts] from others around us - they are not even our own opinions. We absorb and relay the opinions of others simply because we haven't questioned them or, haven't questioned ourselves about our own opinions [we have not felt for our own answers]. Many of us do not even realise that we haven't even questioned anything or, that our opinions are quite often not even our own [thanks to social conditioning].

Most people of any religion say that their way is the only way to God and Heaven. They say that they are right and that others are wrong and they ignore that wrong and right don't exist and they play-down that their idea of wrong and right is just their opinion [and usually second-hand].

Now, if God is in all places at all times in one form or another and we all come from God and God never leaves or separates from us [simply because we are from God and made of God], then aren't we ALL always with God anyway [including those who don't believe in God]? If God is everywhere and is an eternal part of every one of us, don't ALL ways eventually lead to God?

The concept of being separate from God is nothing more than a control-oriented illusion created by the religious so as to isolate non-believers and if you buy into it, it will feel real because by agreeing to the concept with your free will, this is what you will be asking to experience and so, God will let you feel isolated and without God but, this experience of separation will also part of the illusion - given to you so as to satisfy your free will.

If people of religion condemn or judge you for not being with God, tell them where to go nice and loud! God is with everything and everyone in all places all of the time and loves every one of us regardless of our behaviour [God is concerned ONLY with the well-being of the soul] so it is not possible to be disconnected from God because God is love and God loves us. In God loving us, God is not doing anything because God just being Godself IS God loving us.

If people of religion say that *"your unhappiness is a sign that you are not with God"* or *"not on the right path."* or *"because you have chosen the wrong religion."* tell them where to go nice and loud! Not all souls are here purely and only for their own material gain or even emotional happiness. For example; some souls have sacrificed this so as to fulfil a specific purpose that may revolve more around helping others and for these souls, happiness comes in the real-isation of their purpose, which may not occur until the end of their lives or even after.

The religious and self-righteous will judge that you need to *"step into the light."* implying that you are not already in it [not already loved by God]. They will tell you how it is wrong of you to ever feel sorry for yourself, yet when we feel sorry for ourselves all we are doing is acknowledging that we have been through some pain and so, this process is actually partly therapeutic - we are simply taking stock of the cost. It is an examination process where we attempt to understand the mechanics of what we may have experienced when in pain and this is how we can also potentially befriend the pain [by coming to an understanding of it's existence, relevance, and potential benefit]. From this, we may hopefully find benefits for ourselves or for others as well as enabling the chance to just ask *"fuck that hurt, why did that happen? Why did this person do that to me?"*

Do you not sympathise or empathise with those who you care for when they are

suffering? If so, then why not for yourself also? Who does it affect that you may take some time to feel sorry for yourself? It affects you and from this you can then choose how you affect others. It does not directly affect anyone else so up until this point, you simply doing this is not for anyone else's judgement.

Feeling sorry for ourselves is part of a healing process and our true friends will offer council to us - not judgement. What sort of friend says *"Oh I like you and care about you and I want to be your friend, but don't expect me to be your counsellor and stop feeling sorry for yourself"*? When people hold this attitude within their concept of friendship, they deny themselves the opportunity to help another and they therefore miss-out on the benefits to themselves in helping another because, offering advice and healing to others is in itself a form of self-healing and development.

The reason for why and how this works is because everything that we do is at some level done for ourselves. Every 'selfless' act that we commit has a benefit for us and not just for another because when we think that we are doing anything solely for another, we often do not see at the time of how we ourselves will also benefit. We all do ONLY what we choose to do in any given moment and whether consciously done or not, we all choose only that which we believe will benefit ourselves. For example; the 'selfless' act of saving the life of another actually aids both lives involved because through such an act, the lifesaver enhances their knowledge and experience of themselves while enhancing their integrity, self-confidence, self-awareness and self-respect - therefore enhancing their own life and potential for their own benefit.

Accepting that there is no such thing as selflessness goes hand-in-hand with accepting that it's okay [and essential to a degree] to be selfish and in my opinion, selfish behaviours that do not take from others are essential in maintaining a healthy degree of self-respect and assertiveness.

People of religion do not have the right [according to their own books] to judge you but they do. Judgement can lead to us feeling isolated and disconnected and not with God [even though this is never true] but, this can lead to us feeling unworthy and then guilty. The guilt leads to pain and the pain reaches out for understanding and forgiveness but gets greeted with rejection. This causes more pain which eventually leads to twisted thoughts and then we end up doing something 'evil' [through twisted behaviours] and there you have it - their beliefs become a reality even though it was all only judgemental bullshit and, all existing only in their self-righteous minds in the first place.

The self-righteous and the people of religion [who are not necessarily people of God] who at any time tell others that they are *"not with God!"* and that this is why their life is falling apart, do not understand the nature of the God they speak of. They are too ready to pass their self-righteous judgement - while all of the religious books request that the followers of each book do not judge or condemn others and, that they instead leave this to their God.

I believe that God requests that the religious leave any judgement of others to God because God will not judge anyway [God has no needs]. What we do to each other does not affect God, God's existence or God's survival and so there is no purpose or benefit to God in God passing judgement on humans.

The people of religion who tell you that you are not with God when you are expressing anger or any negative emotion, do not understand the nature of their own God and are again, too ready to pass their self-righteous judgement. According to the Bible, didn't Jesus express anger from time to time? Was Jesus not renowned for his outburst in the money lenders markets? Did God abandon Jesus at this time? How would the religious answer this when they say that Jesus was the Holy [perfect and complete] Son of a perfect and complete God?

The Qur'an is said to be the unadulterated word of God, 'tested' and confirmed by Islamic scholars, philosophers and scientists the world-over and, while Allah has some very strong things to say about those who put words in his mouth, you only have to read the statement referring to "*tanks, planes and bombs*" in recent Saudi government-published versions to see that the text is being updated [twisted] by men for political gain, proving that the Qur'an is not actually the word of God at all because, anything else was created by the prophet [regardless of where his information actually came from].

It is a regular and highly patronising comment when the self-righteous and religious condemn and judge others as not being with God, simply and only on the basis that they may express anger or any negative emotion. It is designed to make themselves look God-like and to make others get even angrier and so this judgement is no more than a control mechanism deployed in defence of their personal egos.

What the self-righteous and religious can't accept or even begin to understand, is that God is with all of us and is loving all of us always regardless of anything that we do - God doesn't take sides against God! God's love is not just for a select few because God doesn't judge and because ultimately, we are all from God. It is only the lack of this knowledge that deludes us into thinking that God could ever leave, disconnect, condemn or abandon us. When we think that this is so, we conform to it and start behaving accordingly - even though it is just an illusion. We do things that the religious can label as 'evil' and this in-turn falsely justifies the purpose and existence of religion.

If God would not judge, then how or why would God punish? If God would not judge, then why would God love or assist some over others? Why would God take sides against God and at the same time contradict the notion that we are all equal and that we have free will?

For God to decide to intervene on one's behalf, God would have to judge one as being worthy and this would therefore involve a process of judgement. Why would God help one and not another if God doesn't judge? If God was to assist one and not another, then God would be passing judgement. If one who is God-like asks for God's help, then for God to give it God must judge that this person is worthy. For God to decide who is worthy then God must have to judge who is unworthy but, if we are all part of God, then are we not all worthy all of the time anyway - regardless of anything that we may do or not do?

With this in mind, the only intervention that could take place would have to be free of affecting the choices of others - unless this is also in alignment with their choices [consciously or not]. How could God interfere in the free will of others by assisting some via prayer?

God assisting one person may contradict the free will of another so, if God has given free will to all then God will not contradict this and this implies that God is assisting no one. If we are God and God is us and if we have free will, then is it not up to us to choose to help ourselves? If we use our free will to ask God for God's assistance then God may assist, but how could God assist some and not assist others without passing judgement?

Being that God has no needs, God can not be threatened and so God has no use for laws and rules and we therefore have free will. It's that simple. This leaves that the only way that God could answer prayer is through giving comfort, healing and information/advice because in God doing only these things, God does not directly interfere in the free will of another and, this is why there is no point in praying to a God who has no needs for anything other than comfort, healing and advice. For anything else - take responsibility, stop abusing your free will and do it yourself!

If you believe that nothing happens without God's will [as the religions do], then was God assisting Hitler as much as 'he' was assisting Jesus? If ultimately there is no such thing as 'evil' and nothing is against God because all is God and is from God and because God has no needs and, if the ultimate purpose of God, us and all life is to grow and evolve through experience, then the more we do [good or bad, wrong or right etc] then ultimately, the more we will learn, grow and evolve.

If your life is falling apart, it has nothing to do with God because you have free will and God will not interfere with your life path and its events. You may allow others to make you feel that God is not with you or is even against you but, it is an illusion because God has no needs and is connected to all things at all times because God IS all things at all times so, God is with you and loving you always regardless of what you choose to do with your life.

If the pain and suffering that you observe on this planet causes you to question the existence or nature of God [as it often does with the religious], why blame God when ALL suffering is caused ONLY by humans using their free will? For example; why pray to God to end wars when wars are started by humans? Why pray to God to prevent earthquakes when these are caused by shifts between tectonic plates and their fault lines that we choose to live on, by extracting oil [in my belief], and by fracking?

From the perspective of someone who believes in reincarnation and that death is part of life [not the end of it], suffering [from an Earthly and human perspective] may not actually be what it seems and may instead be just more of what we choose to experience [in alignment with our free will].

For example; since 1986 [when in my mid-teens], I have suffered from an as-yet unidentified progressive bone-dissolving disease, Rosacea on my face and Scleriosis on my head [skin diseases]. In 1990, I developed a sleeping disorder and in 1993, I developed a second form of Scleriosis on my body. Since 1999 and to the present day, I also suffer from an eating disorder, Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and Trigeminal Neuralgia [a progressive brain disease]. They are all managed – you wouldn't know I was ill if you met me but I couldn't work for you 9-5 and without my music or IT skills, I'm at the state's mercy.

I do not believe that any of this is God's will but that instead, I potentially asked for this suffering as part of the life that I chose to incarnate into. It is potential because I believe that throughout my life, that I have had the choice to avoid them [many times] but that other choices I made allowed for their development and, as an early believer that ALL diseases are caused ONLY by emotional distress, I was very conscious when making these choices that they could well lead to serious diseases.

Examples of such choices include that of choosing to fight various court cases, choosing to leave the lives of certain people I love [when leaving only to protect them from the corrupt behaviour of others], actions relating to my political activism and choosing [for various reasons] not to harm those who have harmed me and those I love in fundamental life-changing ways [instead choosing to hold the anger inside while seeking alternative positive and peaceful solutions]. Regardless of the unjust actions of others that may have restricted my choices, I alone made the decisions that led to my health condition – not God.

It is because of this that I believe that a cure for cancer [for example] will NOT be found until we accept that it is a dis-ease caused by emotional distress, and not by physical conditions. Cancer is NOT a virus and so is not a living entity to any degree [as portrayed by many health and charity campaigns].

The concept of wrong and right is so conditioned into our thinking that friends of mine who work in the psychiatric profession actually believe that not believing in wrong and

right is a symptom of psychosis. Some think that not believing in the concept of being policed is also a symptom. None of them have ever been able to explain to me where their guide for wrong and right comes from, yet they seem to know what is universally wrong and right for all of us?

How and why God has no needs

[If – as the religions state, God existed before everything then God has no needs]

Most of my conclusions are based upon God having no needs [because God existed before everything] and, of how we all use free will [because God has no laws] during every moment of our lives so, I would first like to explain how I believe that God could not possibly have any needs;

If God created [if God imagined] everything, then isn't everything from God? [isn't everything loved?] If everything is from God [if everything is loved] and if everything is made up of, and consisting of a connective energy [God/love], then isn't this energy [love] also from God?

If this energy [love] is connected to God [the source of love], then everything is connected to God [in love with God]. This means that God [love] and everything from God is love and, that what we call God and love is actually what we also call life. From this perspective, all of what we refer to as life amounts to actual proof of the existence of God – just not the religious God.

Just because something is not visible to the eye, it doesn't mean that it doesn't exist. Re-member that you've never seen electricity but, you believe it exists because you see the effects of it. You don't see the electricity travelling along the cable but you do see the light that it illuminates at the end of the cable. Electricity is not a very dense energy [relatively speaking] and so it is harder to see with the eyes but all the same, it can be measured and so we accept that it exists.

If the current of the electricity was strong enough and you touched the raw cable, you would then be able to measure its existence by physical feel but take it from me and save yourself a trip to the local A&E [which your freely-elected local 'representative' will probably NOT be defending from government cuts] – electricity does exist!

Life is the effect that we measure through experience, that comes from an energy interaction that is constantly evolving and if God created everything, then didn't God exist before everything and if God existed before everything then God may have desires but, how could God have any needs, dependencies or vulnerabilities?

If God existed before us, then how does God have any needs or requirements of us? What is there in the universe that if it became, would affect God's survival or existence if [as the religions state], God created everything? What would it possibly be that God would depend upon or would be vulnerable to, If God created everything?

Do not confuse needs with wants/desires and you will see that God will exist regardless of anything [that God has no needs]. A need is something that if you are without then you will not survive [at least in your present form]. All humans only ever need oxygen, water, warmth and food and this is all that all humans will ever need to stay alive. A want/desire is anything that is surplus to this. Some wants/desires make life easier and so we have confused a lot of our wants with needs [with the help of corporate marketing departments and social conditioning of course].

We do not actually need a car. We want a car because it makes life easier for us. For the men [and contrary to popular belief] - you will not die if you don't have sex! We do not even need other people because you may choose to end your life to escape the loneliness if you are alone but, it will be your method of choice to end your life that actually kills you and not the loneliness itself.

If God exists and survives regardless of anything that humans do or don't do or, of

anything that anything else does or doesn't do, then this can only mean that God has no needs, dependencies or vulnerabilities and the reason for why God has no needs is because God created everything.

To suggest that there are ways that we could affect the existence and survival of God, is to suggest that God needs something from us - that God is dependent upon us and therefore needs us to behave in a certain way but, this would contradict us having free will and would also contradict the notion that God is all-powerful and, that God was even the creator. If God has no needs, then God does not need us to follow any rules from God or from anywhere because God will exist regardless of what rules we or anything else breaks or doesn't break.

God has set no rules because God created everything and so is vulnerable to nothing. If God is vulnerable to nothing then God can not be threatened by anything and if God can not be threatened by anything, logic alone dictates that this God would have no use for rules. If this so-called 'God' does use rules, then it would be out of desire only or, this 'God' could not be a creator God but, If God desires to use rules when God has no need to then this God is a tyrant.

If God has no needs then God has no need to punish, judge or condemn us for any reason so, if God does punish then God can only be doing this for pleasure - there is no other motive remaining. There is only pleasure because this is all that God would get from doing this and it can only be for pleasure because logically speaking, God would not do anything that would displease God. What sort of a 'God' is this who would punish purely for pleasure? If God has given us free will then what would God even punish us for anyway? If we have free will, where are the laws that we could break?

When humans inflict pain on others purely out of personal desire, we label them as psychopathic. Even if not psychopathic, such a God would have less compassion than most humans because most humans only punish their children because they believe that they need to - not because they desire to.

If God wouldn't punish us, this means that anyone or anything that states otherwise can not be speaking the words of God.

If you see that there is nothing that we could do that would threaten the existence of God, then you are seeing that God has no needs from anything or anyone. God may have a desire to evolve [and in human form, this is through us and our experience] but, it is not a need for God to evolve.

How we know that we have free will

[If God has no purpose for laws then we have free will]

Regardless of your particular belief system, you can believe that you have free will because you use it in every aspect and moment of your life. You may not re-cognise that you use it but you do because even if you are experiencing your freedom being restricted by others, this can only happen if you choose in some way to let it be restricted by others. Even if in prison, no one can stop you from choosing to suffocate yourself by swallowing your tongue so as to end your life and so, you would still be free. You will spend your entire conscious life experiencing that regardless of any influence, you are the one who makes all of your choices.

If God has no needs and if everything is connected to God [loved by God], then how can anything that you ever do be against God? What you think, say and do affects you and even though you are connected to God, you are an individual and God will survive anything you think or do because God has no needs.

If everything is from God and is God, then nothing can become disconnected from God because God is everything everywhere at all times. This means that God always loves you [connects to you] regardless of what you do. It is love through freedom without conditions that God has given you [the ultimate love] - the ability and freedom to make your own choices right up until the last and even beyond our human 'death'.

If we didn't have free will and if everything that happens is only happening in accordance with God's will, what would be the purpose in humans having the ability to make choices in the first place? What would be the point of having the ability to make choices in an existence where these choices would have no effect? If the choices we make have no effect or had already been made at a prior time, then making the choices in real time would have no purpose and if something had no purpose, it wouldn't exist in the first place because all things that exist serve at least one purpose.

Throughout your entire life and right up until the moment of death, you will always have at least two choices to make. When this becomes less than two, you would have died. It is an illusion that you don't already have freedom and, you not re-cognising that you already have all of the freedom that you will ever need suits only those who seek to control you.

When politicians tell you that they want to give you more power, they reinforce the notion that you don't already have all of the power and the illusion is maintained but, only because you do not realise that you already have all of the power [the ability to influence people through your choices].

For example; you may complain about being oppressed by political systems or by the rich, yet it is you who use your existing freedom to choose to either do nothing, or to continue to vote for them and to maintain the system that gives such a corrupt and unrepresentative minority the ability to restrict your choices in the first place. It is you who empowers them and you do this by either doing nothing or, by making choices that enable and allow for this to happen and, you do this because it suits you in some way. There is no one forcing you to buy Rupert Murdoch's lies and no one forcing you to vote for paedophile MPs. You could just as easily choose to abstain and to instead make moves to create and support an alternative system [such as direct democracy], if you wanted to but to want to, you have to at least care.

In the UK and since 1215, every taxpayer has had the legal right to with-hold tax payments if they feel that the government is abusing their money, yet no one exercises this right that was written into law by the law-makers themselves so as to ensure a mechanism for the people to be able to hold ANY government to account for its behaviour.

A man who repeatedly hits his wife will often make statements such as "*She makes me do it, she knows how to push my buttons!*" etc. He will always blame his wife for his own actions as if he had no other choice other than to hit her [where for example; he could have instead chosen to walk away]. His wife can only influence and provoke him but she can not force him to do anything that he himself doesn't choose to do. Even if she physically attacks him without provocation, he still has to choose how he will respond and no one else [not even God] can do this for him.

A wife who complains of being oppressed by her husband can only experience this oppression by choosing in some way to experience it. She could choose to make moves to be free of his behaviour because regardless of how oppressive her husband may be, he can only influence the choices that she makes. He can not make her choices for her - only she herself can do this.

What generally comes from Earthly humans is so-called 'love' with conditions and restrictions, resource-trading relationships and a 'need' for another to make us happy and the 'need' for revenge when we are wronged because we are human and we have human needs and Earthly perceptions. This is not the same for God because even though we are related to God and part of God, we are the human aspect of God living a [mostly] physical existence.

Put simply; we ARE God and God is us, experiencing life from the human perspective.

You could say that God [as a process, not as an entity] is what we call life [energy/love] and life [as a process] is God [energy/love]. Everything is from God, connected to God and IS God and therefore loved by God always and, God has no needs. Humans have needs [even if only perceived or Earthly] and what we think, say and do affects us, not God. Life/God/love/energy will continue evolving with or without humans [as it did before our existence].

We have free will. It is not given to us with any conditions or rules because it is free and it is not a '10% free' offer where in truth, you have to buy the rest of the box in order to benefit from the so-called 'free' offer. Corporate marketing departments have reconditioned our perception of the definition of the word free [along with the word need] to mean that free is only free if you do something else - there is a condition attached. What do you think would happen if you walked into a shop and opened up a jar of coffee, took out the 10% amount of 'free' coffee and walked out without paying for the rest of the jar? If the 10% really was free then why can you not do this? It is simply because the 10% is not really free - it is literally a lie.

In my opinion, we would all be much better-off without this form of highly deceptive corporate conditioning and in a direct democracy, we could use common law to prevent companies from advertising anything as being free unless it actually is truly free and, the people could legislate that businesses have to be honest and use terms such as 'included' or 'bonus' instead. Without direct democracy, the corrupt but freely-elected minority will continue to prioritise the concerns of lobbying corporates who pay to buy or block laws to suit themselves.

For example, the record company that handles my music [EMP] sometimes gives away additional mp3 remixes if people buy the original mix of a particular track. The additional remixes are never advertised as free because they aren't. There is a condition attached and this condition is that people must buy the original mix to get

the remixes without having to pay for them. Within all point-of-sale marketing material, the additional remixes are offered as 'Included with Original Mix' and never as 'Free'. However, EMP does also actually give away some of my music for free and as such, these tracks are labelled as a Free Download because there literally are no conditions attached.

Our freedom [the ability to make choices] is without conditions and you can use your freedom to do anything that you wish and God won't punish you for how you may choose to use your freedom because God has no need to punish you and no desire to punish you and, because God loves you regardless of what you do.

God cares ONLY for the essence [well-being] of your soul [as do angels also].

I truly believe that God and angels are not concerned with human behaviour and so do not judge it [for them, there is no purpose, no desire, and definitely no need for them to do this]. I believe that they are concerned only with the essence and well-being of the soul and its chosen incarnation.

To reiterate; If God created everything then God has no needs. If God has no needs then God has no vulnerabilities. If God has no vulnerabilities then God can't be threatened and if God can't be threatened then God has no use for rules and, this is also why there is no such thing as 'sin'.

Where does the Devil come from?

[If there is no Hell then there is no evil or Devil]

If nothing [ultimately] can be against God because God has no vulnerabilities and because everything is a part of God and is connected to God and so is ultimately of love, then where does this Devil and its evil come from?

If the Devil is from God, [in any form even including that of a so-called 'fallen angel'] then the Devil must be just as holy or unholy as us and therefore just as loved by God and no more or no less 'evil' than any of us. Love heals pain and God is the source of love so God would give love to the Devil because it is the nature of God ONLY to love all that has been created by God. God understands [as some humans do] that pain causes more pain and then dis-ease and that love is the source of all healing and that ONLY love is the anti-dote for what humans label as 'evil'.

This is why God does not discriminate with God's love.

If the Devil is not from God and does exist, then this must mean that the Devil was either created by another God or was a type of self-creating God himself [so as to create himself by himself] but, this theory leaves that there must be more than one God. Can the religions really cover this issue by having it both ways? That's up to you.

If there is only one God and the Devil is not from God and is not from another God and is not a self-creating God himself, then how exactly does the Devil exist if the Devil hasn't even been created by anything? If the Devil hasn't been created, then the Devil can only exist as a concept created by humans.

Leaving this theory aside, let's assume that the Devil is not from God and is therefore a self-creating God or was created by another God [there are no other scenarios]. If the nature of a God is to grow through evolution then wouldn't the Devil be like God if the Devil was a creator God too? If the Devil was a God and didn't love [create], then that would mean that the Devil wasn't actually a God, and that there is only one God so again, there is only one God and the 'Devil' can only exist as a concept in our imagination.

Furthermore, if God condemns man to Hell, how does man enter Hell without permission from the Devil? If the Devil gives permission for God's rejects to enter Hell, then God and the Devil have an arrangement in-place that suits both parties and they therefore form an alliance. This would mean that they would be one and the same, sharing the same goals and desires and, it would also mean that if the Devil did exist, then in misunderstanding the nature of God, the religions have completely misunderstood the nature of this entity also.

How and why the Devil was not an angel

Many religious outlooks consider that the Devil was at one time from God and, that it existed in the form of the most evolved entity before God - an angel.

It seems logical to assume that angels [being so highly evolved] would also be highly intelligent. Once you experience and learn of something, short of having a memory like a sieve or your mind being messed with, how is it possible to not believe in anything [at your core level of knowledge] that you have already experienced? Once something has evolved to a certain state, how could it then be possible for the same something to then un-evolve? Even if the something changed form, it would still carry a degree of individual and collective awareness and intellect at some level gathered upon its journey's experience - just as the human soul does as it journeys through one incarnation to the next.

Assuming that angels are so evolved and so intelligent, why would one of them [apparently Gabriel] relay messages and rules to us that are apparently from a God who has no needs, yet are so judgemental, condemning, threatening, aggressive and violent and of such human orientation? How does it make any logical sense that an Arc angel [for example] would lie to the last prophet or to anyone about the nature of God by portraying that God has needs, rules and punishments?

If God has no needs and we have free will, then wouldn't spreading this misinformation amount to the angel Gabriel going against the word of God but, according to some religions, isn't it supposed to be the angel Lucifer [Satan] that went against the word of God?

How is it possible that the prophet was listening to the word of a God [delivered through any source] who created everything and who therefore has no needs, when these words are filled with jealousy, demands, threats, and statements that condemn and divide? If [as the religions state], God created everything, then it is NOT possible. What is possible and what is happening is wholesale denial of this by those who fear to question it, which in itself is a strong sign of acknowledgement at some deeper level, of a corrupt belief system.

I don't believe that the prophet was insane and neither do I believe that he was listening to an angel or to any entity that was being honest about the nature of God and what God wants from us. I instead believe that the prophet was simply being exploited by an entity that was faking because, God has no needs and an honest entity would understand this and its implications and so would talk ONLY of this.

According to the Qur'an, Mohammed's own descriptions of his own experience in the cave are more akin to the descriptions that most would use to describe the presence of a negative entity and not a positive entity, an angel, or a loving and guiding entity of a God who has no needs. The prophet describes feeling a terrible fear along with a host of other feelings and perceptions that are so much more in alignment with that of a purely negative entity experience.

Others who have had similar experiences [through meditation - as with the prophet], would say that from their own experiences, they would take this to be the presence of a negative entity. They would describe the experience of the presence of an angel as being warm, reassuring and more aligned to the complete opposite to that of Mohammed's experience.

Many developed spiritualists, psychics, mediums, scientists, religious practitioners and people of all walks will explain of how in their experiences of being in the presence of an entity, the skin acts as an interface detecting the true nature of any entity [as the

eyes can be fooled]. They say that the skin goes cold and prickly [especially at the back of the limbs and of the body itself] and they say that these physical feelings are accompanied by fear and sometimes, by freezing on the spot and streaming from the eyes without crying [as I myself have once experienced]. The same people would describe the experience of the presence of a positive entity as being the exact opposite of this and of Mohammed's experience [and I would agree].

According to the Qur'an, Mohammed himself even questioned [with his first wife] if he himself was [in his own words] deluded. According to the Qur'an, it was only his wife who believed and then told him that the presence/entity was that of the angel Gabriel bringing the word of God but also according to the Qur'an, Mohammed's wife was never once with him in the cave whilst he was using meditation to open himself up to anything around at the time.

In my opinion, the prophet's wife was literally throwing [projecting] her outlook and her beliefs onto her husband and his experience. She was making them real ['facts']. He was not deluded when he himself questioned if he was deluded, but became deluded via his wife's influence as she completed the manifestation of her desired reality on to his experience.

Mohammed was a politician and a leader who cared about unity and peace and according to the Qur'an, Mohammed also actually believed and spoke of Heaven being on Earth [as this document later does also]. Mohammed's wife was also a believer, seeker and promoter of love, peace and order in the world and the nature and orientation of both of their misinterpretations of what was happening to Mohammed clearly demonstrates this. What is not in alignment with their intentions is anything that states that Allah has needs and requirements of men or of anything. It is my belief that the information was contaminated and that this is because it was not actually delivered from an evolved source and, this is also my reason for why you will find contradictions within the texts of such books.

To summarise; if Mohammed's entity was a loving angel from Allah, wouldn't Mohammed have experienced feeling love, peace, compassion and reassurance [at least], not the opposite, as the prophet himself describes? Wouldn't this 'divine' information talk of a God with no needs at least?

Inverting the outlook; if Mohammed had experienced feeling love, peace, compassion and reassurance, would his wife then have told him that the entity was of an evil orientation?

If she would have said that an angel could present both experiences, then how could it be true that an angel would inflict fear in any circumstances, when Allah has no need or requirement to cause pain and suffering to anyone? A God who has the need to inflict pain is a God with needs and a 'God' with needs could only exist after the existence of the things that it would need and so can not be a creator God. A 'God' who inflicts pain and suffering simply out of desire [not out of need], would be a 'God' who is the same as the Devil. I believe that Mohammed's wife was simply projecting on to this entity and, the nature of what she projected was oriented in the beliefs of someone who is God-fearing, and not God-loving. Wouldn't those who fear God also fear 'his' angels – as she did?

For this reason, it can only be that a follower of Mohammed who finds him or herself to be in conflict with the Qur'an and its contradictions is a true follower of Allah – not of the Qur'an. The Muslim who finds his or herself at peace with the violent contradictions that justify the on-set of fear and pain onto others [for any reason] is a true follower of the unquestioned word of the men who wrote and re-wrote the texts – just as the Saudi Government now does.

Why do Muslims not question what Mohammed was in communication with when he himself did?

Is the answer to this question the same as for why not to re-cognise that Allah has no needs and has given free will? Is it because the Muslim psyche actually already believes a deeper truth? Is it because the Islamic sub-consciousness re-cognises that the answers to its own questions will contradict the Qur'an itself? Is Islam afraid to ask questions because ultimately, it believes that the answers will tear Islam apart and bring all into question? Is it because people do not like to see anything that contradicts their current beliefs and so fight against it or anyone who does question them?

For Muslims, it has always been an on-going automatic, pre-programmed assumption that Mohammed was in communication with the angel Gabriel. It has never been questioned even though Mohammed himself questioned this and, his 'reality' was defined by his wife who wasn't even in the cave with him – not by him.

The word of the Imam comes from the word of the Qur'an which comes from the word of the prophet which comes from the word of angel Gabriel which comes from the word of Allah?

The word of the priest comes from the word of Jesus which comes from the word of the Bible which comes from the word of Moses which comes from the word of God?

...And we all know what happens in a game of Chinese Whispers!

Re-cognising that the nature of evil is simply mismanaged human emotional fear and guilt [and therefore that the Devil is a just a metaphor and that Hell is therefore a self-induced, self-created, guilt-influenced state of mind - experienced in accordance with free will], while considering that what we call 'ghosts' and 'demons' may simply be discarnate fragments of human energy [as opposed to an actual soul] would be beneficial to all and not just to the religious.

How can we believe beyond uncertainty, that Mohammed wasn't taking doctrine from one of these lost fragments pretending [or even believing itself] to be the angel Gabriel? How would Mohammed himself have known even? It was Mohammed's wife who interpreted his experience in the cave for him and it was her who told him that the source of his 'divine' doctrine was the angel Gabriel - and she wasn't even with him at the time. After all, the books of all religions do state that God has needs and requirements of us, and this contradiction with logic in the Qur'an [for example] does indicate that the information from Mohammed's entity was not pure but was corrupt - a God of love and peace who desires to punish when 'he' has no need to?

How can we believe beyond uncertainty, that Moses wasn't taking doctrine from one of these lost fragments pretending [or even believing itself] to be God? Christian history shows that the Bible is a compilation of edits taken from 87 different books. One of these was written by Mary Magdalene [who spent more time with Jesus than anyone else] and no aspects of her book were included in the compilation [edited by men].

Science has not found one artefact from over half a million people spending any time in the desert [let alone forty years] and Judaism still ignores the science that shows that the world has existed for longer than six thousand years and, while I myself believe in the existence in history of Jesus, I am aware that science has provided no evidence of his existence also and so, I remain open about this too.

Was Moses listening to the word of a God who has no needs and has given us free will, or to his own will and inner fears when he created the Ten Commandments? How is it possible to disobey a God who has no rules? Where do these rules, laws and sins come from? Free will is complete, not partial. How can something be given with both freedom and restrictions at the same time and still be called free?

Were both of these men [if Moses even existed at all] exploited by such entities because they were so passionate about bringing peace? Could this passion have made them vulnerable if they were not fully aware of the source of their doctrine?

God's love is not conditional.

I ask these questions because if nothing is against God [especially angels] because God has no needs [which angels would understand], then it must have been man who invented the concept of laws, the Devil, sin and evil.

Maybe most of the prophets [if they did exist] were listening to themselves and to other sources that were not re-recognised during the process? Where is the divine proof to all men that these men were not simply talking with loose discarnate human and/or non-human entities [what some refer to as 'ghosts'] pretending to be spirit guides and angels etc?

At the end of the day, we have a book called Peace/Surrender [as if these two terms could ever be synonymous] that justifies the use of inter-marital rape and battery [forms of violence], compiled by someone who believed in the use of violence and who waged war [Mohammed was a military man] yet, who taught others to respect the teachings of Jesus, when Jesus did not advocate the use of violence even in self-defence.

The ONLY peace that results from surrender is peace from the mouth because although your mind and your heart will be screaming out in pain, your mouth will be silent.

Unless someone or something meddles with your thinking, isn't it quite safe to assume that once you know of something, that you will always know of it? If angels at least understand that God has no needs, why would one of them ignore this knowledge and behave as a human would?

Why would something so evolved, choose to become less evolved or less aware? How could this even be possible? What would the benefit be to something so evolved or to God? How is it possible when the nature of all life is to grow, to go forward, to evolve?

Is it not more likely that it is man who is either lying, self-deluded, or both? These men seem to have nothing more than their own conviction [or that of their wives] and it has not been questioned - merely followed by many out of fear and ignorance since a time when a simple, fearful and unquestioning mind was of the norm.

Regardless of your particular religious beliefs, if you believe in the nature and behaviour of Jesus, how can you also believe in the teachings of another who encourages the use of violence [in any circumstances] without question, and visa versa? Anything that encourages the use of violence in any circumstances [including in self-defence] can not be of the word of God because God is of love only and is all-knowing, all-forgiving, and has no need to take sides in human-created disputes, conflicts and wars.

The Qur'an encourages respect for Christianity and for the teachings of Jesus but since becoming self-aware, did Jesus ever encourage or use violence - even in self-defence?

The nature of Evil

[If there is no Hell then there is no evil or Devil]

In my opinion, psychology, quantum mechanics and metaphysics can explain most about what the religious would call 'evil spirits'. Through these sciences, we can see that the glass on the Ouije board is moved by the subconscious minds of the people around the table. They are all holding it but with one person exerting more mental [not physical] energy than the others and so the glass moves towards a character on the board that this person has subconsciously selected. His arm muscles will be in touch with this subconscious thought and so it will move - without this person being aware of any of this. Through the study of body language, we already believe that there is a relationship between our subconscious thoughts, conscious thoughts and our physical expressions.

Other forms that we label as evil may just be discarnate energy matter of varying levels of consciousness and density - not necessarily evil. If such entities were evil then they would be under the illusion that they were separate from God and even possibly against God but, this could only be self-induced delusion because God is in all things because all things come from God and are God. Ultimately, nothing can be against God because God has no needs and, because everything is actually God anyway.

Re-cognising that the nature of evil is simply mismanaged human emotional fear and guilt [and therefore that the Devil is a just a metaphor and that Hell is therefore a self-induced, self-created, guilt-influenced state of mind - experienced in accordance with free will], while considering that what we call 'ghosts' and 'demons' may simply be discarnate fragments of human energy [as opposed to an actual soul] would be beneficial to all and not just to the religious.

If God has no needs and so no rules and we therefore have free will, then God would not need to create an enemy for Godself or for us because God loves us and moves with purpose. God does not need to create anything so maybe God creates because it is the nature of God and anything of nature, to grow through the experience of creation and co-creation? It is governments, scared and guilty men and the deluded that create 'enemies' and it is us who buy into their unquestioned divisive bullshit.

God may know everything but, how does this means that God has the experience of being human and of living on this planet? Observing something or believing in something isn't the same as experiencing something.

If we are connected to God, maybe we are the part of God who wants to grow through understanding the actual experience of human physical life - not just through having the knowledge of it? If this is so, wouldn't God [the part that is us] actually require free will so as to be open to all of the potential choice-making in any decisions that we could make throughout our lives? If God Source [the part that isn't us directly] wanted to learn about Godself in the most efficient and creative way, then why would God choose to restrict the learning of Godself by restricting our choices? How would this be productive in helping God to know or experience Godself?

Whilst God would not actually need for us to have free will, does it not make sense that God would desire for this in order to achieve being able to freely consider all options at all times of life through God's human experience of us?

If the purpose and nature of God is to grow through experience [to evolve], then it is fundamental that God gives us unrestricted, unconditioned free will, or God simply can

not grow.

If the Devil came from God and is connected to God, then how can it be true that the nature of the Devil is to go against God [to go against Godself]? How can it be logical that anything that is from God and part of God would benefit from going against God - even if this was actually possible [even if God was vulnerable to something]?

When someone does something negative that we don't understand or don't wish to understand, we call it 'evil' or "*an act of the Devil!*" - yet we punish the person. We punish them in many ways but, if we treat others as evil then we will see them as evil because they will appear to behave as if they were evil, and so on.

When we decide that something occurred because of 'evil', we don't even start to try to understand what the real reasons were that could have led to the occurrence. We completely dismiss this option and so we find no sustainable solutions [freely-elected politicians who pretend to represent you provide only gimmicks] and what this means is that new victims will continue to be made.

Although there is much about human nature and 'evil' that we would naturally not wish to understand, our children would benefit massively if we did and in my opinion, we actually owe this to them. While religious cultures seek only to label, judge and condemn [demonstrating cowardice and irresponsibility], a responsible culture would instead choose to face its fears and would challenge itself to seek to understand these aspects so as to be able to prevent further proliferation.

Two common examples of this [demonstrated by both religious and non-religious people alike] are of attitudes towards both terrorism and child abuse [especially paedophilia]. If both were treated as illnesses and not as 'evils', we could start to treat the ill and therefore reduce the proliferation and its effects and eventually, less victims would be created until such a time when these two dis-eases were completely eradicated from human cultures.

In my efforts to understand both terrorism and child abuse [particularly neglect and paedophilia] and, prompted by my own relevant direct experiences since 1999, I have researched them both as thoroughly as I could and I conclude with the following;

Terrorism

The victims of terrorism and the terrorists who kill them are both victims.

I believe that anti-Western terrorism is caused by corrupt Western foreign policy combined with the religious indoctrination that lies about God having needs and requirements because, it is this aspect of the indoctrination that the extremists and terrorists use to 'justify' their actions [regardless of the causes and influences] and, it is brutal Western foreign policy that incites this in the first place.

The reason for why terrorist organisations target civilian populations is not because civilians are soft targets [as Western governments constantly tell us] but is instead actually because ultimately, it is the civilian population [the majority in any country] that is responsible for its country's system of governance. If a population chooses to shirk this responsibility and to leave all foreign policy decisions to 'representatives' who the civilian population freely choose to empower, then how exactly are civilian populations not part-responsible for the causes of terrorism?

This is also the philosophy behind why Western governments use sanctions against countries and this is why I therefore also regard government-imposed sanctions placed upon any civilian population as a form of terrorism. The principals are exactly the same - hurt the civilian population directly so as to motivate them to change their system of governance.

Only terrorist organisations [which by my definition includes Western governments]

are responsible for their actions and while acts of terrorism can never be justified, the civilian majority is though ultimately responsible for the influences and policies that their freely-elected governments promote that give terrorists a cause and, a reason to exist. Why do you think it is that only certain countries are targeted and that the US and Europe come-off worse? It is not due to 'bad luck' or 'evil' [there are no such things because everything happens for a reason and because God has no vulnerabilities].

Direct democracy is the only democracy [rule of the people] and, direct democracy would enable whole societies to take full responsibility for their country's policies and actions but, this is something that has to be chosen by the people and from where I'm looking, it seems quite certain that the human race is willing to keep abusing its existing freedom by choosing to maintain such systems of oppression and, will do so until these systems wipe us all out.

Western governments and their state-controlled media have distorted the definition of terrorism so as to suit their own aims. Civilian defenders of occupied territories who take-up arms in defence of an invading armed force and who do not target non-combatant civilians [such as the East Ukrainian separatists] are often labelled as 'terrorists', when in my view they are simply freedom fighters.

Throughout my life, I have met former UK servicemen who served in Cyprus after Turkey's invasion and ALL label the Greeks as terrorists [ALL Greeks]. When I asked them why they have this view, they say nothing specific and when I remind them that the UK invaded a foreign land and ask them what right they had to be there in the first place, they also have nothing to say about this. When I then ask about the tactic commonly used by UK forces of pouring napalm and other liquid-fire oriented weapons into caves so as to murder Greek resistance members, I am told they deserved it because they were terrorists.

To me, terrorism is the commission of any act that knowingly and willingly promotes and instils terror within a non-combatant civilian community - by any means. This definition can apply to Prime Ministers and invading armies as much as it can to militarised civilians, resistance fighters and freedom fighters.

In the twisted Western lamestream media, freedom or resistance fighters who do not target non-combatant civilians are always labelled as terrorists, while Western governments that commit to the military invasion of any territory in contradiction of international law have God on their side!

I believe that a more productive solution for eradicating terrorism will only come in addressing ALL of the reasons for terrorism and I believe that whilst there is no justification for terrorism, there are reasons for its existence. I believe that some of the reasons may also very well revolve around aspects of past British global imperialism and separately, I also believe that there are people who use philosophy and religion so as to influence and incite others who have no political issues against anyone.

I believe without a doubt that drone attacks are a direct cause of anti-Western terrorism and I also believe that Israel's continued violations of over three hundred and fifty UN resolutions, US support for Israel's violations, Western support of oppressive regimes and a disregard for the well-being of foreign civilians are all promoters of terrorism.

Some time ago, I wrote and published the following poems to try to express how I believe drones are a direct cause of anti-Western terrorism:

Airfix Airforce

The man you now call evil,
He used to be a dad,
The man you call a weasel,
A family he once had,

When fire fell from the sky,
He had no reason why,
His government couldn't save them,
He watched his family die,

No one came to tell him,
Why foreigners took his wife,
No one came to tell him,
Why they ruined his life,

This man he used to laugh,
And take away the pain,
A doctor he once was,
But now his family slain,

The kill ratio is four to one,
Civilians verses evil ones,
But *"That's okay!"* says USA,
"We're saving lives the old school way!"

With our 'mate' Dave not far behind,
His Airfix Airforce goes to find,
An 'evil do-er' on the ground,
Where civilians sleep all safe and sound,

"We're in it together" - that's bloody true,
Our taxpayer cash will see it through,
Our vote will let the whole world know,
That foreigners lives are valued low,

When someone takes your child away,
Your pain will twist and turn all day,
And by the time the day is through,
You'll be someone you never knew.

Joystick Warriors

So David Cameron has revealed,
Soon the deal it will be sealed,
The UK starts to use its drones,
And who they kill, no one knows,

Joystick warriors safe at home,
Selling their honour for any old bone,
A bone that David Cameron throws,
And where it lands, no one knows,

He says we need to kill the threat,
"Bomb from the skies - save British lives!"
And of those caught-up in his net,
He'll give us bull and sexed-up lies,

As Afghan villagers start to die,
And you still ask the question why,
"Do Afghan troops still kill the Brits?"
It's 'cause we blew their kids to bits.

I believe that outlawing certain groups and alienating foreign regimes actually makes our societies more vulnerable because as we lose contact, we then lose the knowledge of their thinking, perceptions and intentions. This breakdown in communication and isolation leads to fear and this eventually leads to negative actions - just as it does in any relationship.

We can not stop people from getting together unless we imprison them, which in my view would be completely undemocratic because it is not thinking or talking that directly threatens others but, it is the actions that represent these thoughts, feelings and emotions that can potentially become the threat.

I believe that we should all be allowed to think and say as we wish and that while others have the choice not to listen or agree, they should not have the right to prevent others from thinking or saying as they so choose.

If we criminalise conversations and debate then we impair true communication and if we criminalise thoughts, we would all be in prison. It is the actions of people that directly affect others and so in a true and direct democracy, this would be all that others have a right to interfere with. If we feel the 'need' to stop others from getting together, then what is it within our society that we're not addressing? What are the reasons for why these people feel the need to get together secretly in the first place?

I also disagree with the UK policy of deporting convicted terrorists because in my view, deporting terrorists allows for a loss of control while enabling for the potential re-grouping of terrorists abroad - making the UK less secure. I believe that addressing the fears of others increases understanding and the forward-development of relationships and I believe that this is essential in seeking peaceful solutions and in curbing negative actions.

For example; in 2014 the UK deported extremist Islamic preacher Abu Qatada to Jordan where he faced charges relating to terrorism. He was acquitted and is now free to join Al'Qaeda [who he openly supports] across the border in Syria and being that Al'Qaeda are being bombed [along with ISIS] by the West, he will no doubt be recruiting and training radicals with Al'Qaeda in Syria to launch attacks on UK soil.

I do not believe in appeasement via in cash or in any form and I believe as the UK government does when it states that; *"You can't buy the Taliban, you can only hire them."* and so in my opinion, the idea of paying them as part of a long-term solution for peace and stability in Afghanistan [for example] seems absolutely retarded. If the ideals of such people are available for sale, then we will be paying them for ever because their ideals often come second to money.

When I was in Tunisia before the uprisings began in 2011, the majority of people I spoke with actually told me that they did not want a Western idea of democracy and they stated that they believe it to be more corrupt than their dictatorship. They told me that they weren't bothered about removing their dictator and that they just wanted more rights and a better standard of living.

The main reason given for discontent with the idea of adopting any Western political system was because it is Western political systems that oppress them through the control of their dictatorships and, this is also for why the Arab Spring is not a true uprising and it won't be until Arabia completely rejects any Western 'support' [violent intervention, revolutions and corrupt elections where the candidates are always selected from the previous regime's people] and form their own governments or administrations free of Western influence.

The UK taxpayer is still supporting [through weapons and surveillance equipment supplies] the violent oppressive regimes of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain and others and in Syria and by mid-2013, David Cameron had so far given over £110 M to the

FSA [Free Syria Army] and Al'Qaeda so as to fight a proxy war against the Syrian government in the full knowledge of how the FSA are using fatwas to 'allow' themselves to rape and murder women and children who live in pro-government and neutral areas. What makes me so sick is that the BBC have known about this and have consistently decided not to report about it [to suit the government] while it makes headline news outside of the US and EU!

In the UK, the taxpayer has had the legal right since 1215 to with-hold tax payments if they feel that the UK government is abusing their money, yet not one single working person has done this - they're too busy hating the poor and those on social benefits in their own country to give a shit [another Tory-influenced propaganda campaign].

In 2012, the CIA itself confirmed that out of fifty four Jihadist fighters caught and questioned in Afghanistan by one of its own directors, only four were fighting against the US for philosophical/religious reason, with the majority fighting simply because they were offered a decent wage to do so.

It is my absolute belief that the solution to ending ALL global terrorism lies in shaping foreign policy around how we ourselves expect to be treated, while educating the extremists of how God has no needs.

Child abuse [including neglect, paedophilia, physical abuse and psychological abuse]

A combination of events that occurred in my life many years ago made me realise that it is society as a whole [not just bullies and paedophiles] that is to blame for the proliferation of all forms of abuse against children and, I put particular emphasis on the following;

1. Christianity [for influencing UK common law to the point where family law prioritises the sanctity of Christianity above the protection and well-being of the child].

One particular aspect of family law that has been influenced by Christianity is the law that requires that men who have fathered a child, must be married to the mother at the time of conception so as to be recognised as a father. This was always a strict Christian law but it has been lurking in the dark and twisted depths of UK family law since the day that King Alfred appointed himself as England's spiritual 'leader' and decided to base ALL English law on Moses' Ten Commandments.

What this means is that when applying for custody or access to his children through the courts, a man must first prove that he is the father because, paternity is not recognised by UK family law unless the man was married at the time of conception and, marriage is strictly a religious ceremony [unlike a civil partnership].

Unknown to most people, although the completion and submission of birth certificates is a legal requirement, birth certificates are not themselves legal documents and this is why mothers have the right within law, to name any man they please as the 'father' [not necessarily the true father].

To summarise, despite the potential emotional harm that will be visited upon a child who may eventually come to learn the truth in later life, mothers have the legal right to lie to their children about their heritage but, while it is legally acceptable to lie to her own child, no one is allowed to lie to a judge in a UK court!

I myself have acquired first-hand experience of witnessing UK family courts rejecting documents submitted by child psychologists that warn judges of the potential harm caused by Parental Alienation and Parental Kidnap and, they never explain their rejection of such advice and if a plaintiff asks for an explanation, he will be threatened immediately with contempt of court just for asking.

How an unwed man becomes recognised as a father by UK family law is by first

having to secure a court order for Parental Responsibility and only when this has been granted is the man recognised as a father by the court and, it is only after this point that he can then apply for a court order to secure custody or access.

The legal process is then delayed and any delay potentially gives the mother opportunities to begin a programme of Parental Alienation, to commit Parental Kidnap or to further obstruct in other ways such as organising conspiracies with 3rd parties] and, the courts are fully aware of this.

Regarding the issue of access, fathers have to apply for a court order for Parental Access if the mother is being obstructive and is not willing to co-parent after the relationship has ended. In being obstructive, she may have good reason and so it is only fair that the courts are made aware of any concerns and assess them appropriately [and with court-assigned 3rd parties if required] but, in not penalising mothers who lie and/or who violate court orders or who don't even attend mediation services arranged by the court, mothers are actually encouraged to behave in such ways and, knowing that the father may be too scared to face certain allegations even if untrue, cases of Parental Alienation and Parental Kidnap by mothers have risen by approximately 80% since Tony Blair took office in 1997 and, assisted by the then President of the UK Family Courts 'Lady' Elizabeth Sloss – now known to have been involved in covering-up for church bishops regarding incidences of child abuse!

Incidentally, 'Lady' Sloss was David Cameron's first choice to run the investigation into establishment child abuse cover-ups in July 2014 and even as she was resigning her post before even starting [due to the news breaking about her history with covering-up for child abusing church bishops], David Cameron still fought to have her and, against the expressed wishes of victims groups.

Within weeks of Tony Blair's New Labour coming to power, his Home Office sent a secret memo to all UK court welfare officers telling them that they must always come down on the side of the mother and, I only know about this because a contact of mine knew a CWO who quit her job because of this policy being implemented. All of this confirms that the state wants mothers to be able to do as they wish – regardless of the abusive effects upon the child.

After seeing the UK Parliament vote to outlaw the criticism of religion in 2012, David *"I'd like the UK to become more Christian"* David Cameron, his religious influenced mis-representative Parliament and the pathetic UK judiciary can go and fuck themselves or, sue me for anti-Semitism [which despite the propaganda put-out by Judaism is NOT about the issue of race and is only about the issue of being anti-religious and, I have no issue with race].

2. All religions [for condemning child abusers as 'evil', and not ill].

To misunderstand the nature of God is also to misunderstand the nature of evil and of the Devil [and therefore to fail to reach a point where one real-ises that there is no 'evil' or no 'Devil'] and as both are purely religious concepts, we should never hear the terms *"evil"* or *"the Devil"* being mentioned by a member of the judiciary in a court of common law.

It is too easy and habitual for the self-righteous to simply label others as 'evil' and to think no further [it makes them feel better about themselves] and, when people tell abusers that they are 'evil' when they are maybe just ill and in need of help and therapy, the chances that the abuser will re-offend increase. The reason for this is because when we as a society make people feel separate to us and to God and unworthy of love and acceptance, we leave them in a place where they feel so isolated and condemned that they themselves come to agree that they are 'evil' and when this happens, they can then arrive at a place where the only purpose that they can see to

their own existence is to continue to do more of the same – to re-offend. For others, this will also be compounded by a feeling of rebellion which will further incite their abusive behaviour.

For some people, guilt can prevent them from recommitting an act that led them to feel guilty in the first place but for others, it is actually the guilt itself that can influence them to condemn themselves further and to then behave accordingly.

To summarise; when people write themselves-off or are influenced to feel unworthy, they are more likely to continue to commit the act that they are being condemned for and obviously, this is good for no one.

The other aspect is that when institutions label abusive acts as 'evil', society is then less inclined to investigate other potential causes that don't revolve around being 'evil' and again, this is good for no one.

In my opinion, societies simply writing-off acts of abuse as 'evil' and failing to investigate such acts for alternative motives only serves to proliferate such acts and it's just not good enough and not a society that I want to be a member of. These acts may be of a dark nature but, if we don't come to thoroughly understand them, we will never be rid of them.

3. The Judiciary [for condemning abusers as 'evil' and for prioritising a CWO's personal views of a parent].

For condemning abusers as 'evil':

Time and time again, solicitors, barristers and judges use the term 'evil' in their questions, statements, arguments and summing-up during common law hearings all across the UK. This is fine if they're expressing this term in-line with their own personal opinions but, to use it as part of a legal argument is just completely inappropriate. Even if religious sentiments were legally acceptable, what relevance would they have if either a judge, solicitor, barrister, plaintiff or suspect were an Atheist?

Another negative aspect of religious terms being legally acceptable in a UK court of common law is that of social conditioning because, when the unquestioning read of statements made during a court case in the lamestream media time and time again, they become less inclined to question the true nature of things, instead settling on second-hand opinions [it becomes a form of subliminal advertising for the now-corporate religions].

For prioritising a CWO's personal views of a parent:

Regarding supervised parental access, how is it fair for a child to have its relationship with a parent completely severed on all levels, simply because a supervising court welfare officer may not personally like or get-on with a parent who they are assessing - when that same CWO has expressed that they observed no issues of parental concern during any contact sessions?

There are thousands of children across the UK who have been stripped of their right to a relationship with a non-custodial parent [on ALL levels], simply because a CWO didn't like that particular parent and even when according to that same CWO, that parent has demonstrated that there is no need for supervised access. In my view, this is lawful child abuse and in principal, hurting a child so as to hurt a parent is no different to terrorism.

Case after case after case will show you that it simply isn't true that government non-disclosure orders are imposed so as to protect the child. They are in-place ONLY to protect themselves because as with the judiciary, the government has so much to hide regarding family law, its religious influences and its wholly abusive attitude towards

both children and non-custodial parents.

I hold the courts completely responsible for the following key specific points and I regard all of them to be forms of lawful child abuse:

- Failing to prioritise the needs and well-being of the child over the desires of the custodial parent by not upholding orders awarded against the custodial parent when broken.

- Failing to prioritise the needs and well-being of the child by not acknowledging the existence and effects of Parental Alienation and Parental Kidnap.

- Failing to prioritise the needs and well-being of the child by not allowing the entry of witness statements from contact centre supervisors and/or others, regarding events that may occur at supervised contact centres.

- Failing to prioritise the needs and well-being of the child by allowing CWO's to visit the custodial parent at home when the child is present, potentially further alienating the pursuing parent.

- Failing to prioritise the needs and well-being of the child by allowing CWO's to prioritise their personal relationship and view of a non-custodial parent, over the parental abilities of that parent.

- Choosing to ignore the advice of child psychologists from across the UK who submit statements during hearings that testify to all of the above and, who state that ALL of these aspects are abusive towards children.

4. Freudian-educated types [for assuming as standard, that most abusers have themselves been abused].

In my opinion, those who work in any field who have studied and who now follow, practice and regurgitate the principals of 'psychologist' and so-called 'expert' Sigmund Freud, are doing a disservice to themselves and to others. In my opinion, ALL of Freud's theories are based upon corrupt ethics and along with all of the world's religions, he has forgotten that we have free will [because a creator God would have no needs] and he has flown-off out into the ether without this in mind and therefore, has reported back with contaminated conclusions.

It is to me also no coincidence that it was his multi-millionaire Tory Grandson who authored the terrible and abusive 'Bedroom Tax' policy in the UK in 2013 – while taking David "We're in it together" Cameron's 5% tax break and, while living in a multi-bedroom mansion where he is excluded from having to pay mansion tax [as all multi-millionaires in the UK are].

The reason for why I believe that Freud was fundamentally corrupt in his thinking is due to the evidence that can be found within Freud's own theories and philosophies themselves [just as evidence that the religions are lying about the nature of God are also found in their own theories and philosophies]. Freud's theories clearly show a severe lack of even just a basic understanding of the nature of human beings [being that of entities that have the ability to make their own choices] because, one of his strongest beliefs was that all babies should be given LSD at birth. Personally, I have enjoyed many LSD trips but in promoting such a concept, Freud clearly demonstrates that he fails to understand and/or respect that to be human is to be able to make choices and his theory overrides this aspect – not even re-cognising his own massive contradiction in the first place and, his principals are also in perfect alignment with the principals of rape.

In this belief, he also demonstrates that he is [at least in principal] a child abuser too because his ethics towards the natural and human rights of children are no different to those who would support and promote forced child sterilisation and/or child

circumcision [for example] which in my belief, are both direct forms of legalised child abuse. As a side-issue, I've always found it interestingly hypocritical how our 'model', 'developed', 'civilised' society loves to go paedophile hunting, while not even expressing any statements about forced child sterilisation or child circumcision - never mind actually going and hunting these legal abusers down.

Since 2010, UK taxpayers have consented to David Cameron using their money to fund an illegal forced child sterilisation programme in Indian schools that actually kills many of these girls. The UN has written to him directly and has explained how and why his policy is illegal and they demanded that he terminate it with immediate effect. He completely ignored them and didn't even respond and when in 2014, the UN came to carry out an inspection of UK immigration centres so as to resolve serious allegations of sexual assault made by detainees, he had secret service agents meet them at Heathrow, where they swiftly put them on a return flight back to New York and as usual, the BBC chose not to report anything about this serious violation of UK and international law.

The UK people freely choose to continue to empower such people to make decisions for them simply because they can't be bothered to politically educate themselves or to get involved in their own country's political process. The UK people are too busy watching the BBC, Sky Sports, porn, Coronation fucking Street, reading about other people's sex lives and getting pissed to ever give a shit - even when it affects their children [who in my belief are still largely viewed and treated as commodities by the state and by many UK parents].

Leaving aside Freud's principals that are in perfect alignment with those who abuse children, his theories that we ALL select potential partners based upon how other family members look and, that most abuse victims have themselves been abused are in my opinion primitive, inaccurate and damaging to society and especially damaging towards children.

With many current abuse and relationship counsellors still practising such limited, primitive and abusive principals while closing themselves-off to alternative and progressive theories and principals regarding human psychology, I conclude that Freud's contributions have amounted to nothing short of being completely socially destructive or, distracting at best.

Not all abusers have been abused themselves and, some abuse purely and only out of sexual desire, as opposed to being influenced to abuse through inappropriate conditioning via the experience of abuse as a child. Paedophiles who belong to the group I refer to here are those who will often themselves say that for reasons unknown to them, they feel physical sexual urges to interact with children when around them and, they acknowledge that such behaviour is abusive and harmful. I believe that most paedophiles of any orientation are fully-aware that what they do can only be damaging and abusive - regardless of how they themselves were conditioned.

Some paedophiles though do not themselves real-ise that what they do is abusive and instead, actually believe that what they are doing when being sexually abusive towards children is the appropriate way to express love to a child. They believe this simply because they have been inappropriately conditioned through the experience of abuse as a child themselves and have not been rehabilitated and so do not know this and so do not see that there is a chain that they have a responsibility [even though not their fault] to break.

We currently have something of an understanding about the thinking and behaviour of paedophiles who abuse children due to past conditioning [whether they consciously re-cognise that their behaviour is harmful or not] but, we do not seem to have much understanding of paedophiles who have not been conditioned through the experience

of abuse as children and yet, who also have urges to interact sexually with children and so, the following is my theory about this group's psycho-sexuality;

The human brain has various neurological elements that work together to help us to deal specifically with context and, it is these components that allow us to perceive and define things as being within a certain context. From having an understanding of context, humans can then act consciously and appropriately and, it is also context that gives words and phrases their meaning [as opposed to the words themselves being the only conduit for any meaning].

To summarise; the ability to contextualise allows the human mind to choose to compare, re-frame, judge, and interact accordingly and appropriately. If the ability to choose to contextualise is void or compromised in the minds of adults, they won't necessarily see a small child when looking at one because the contextual aspects of small and large/adult or child simply don't exist within such a mindset or its associated outlook. Whatever it is they see, they do not necessarily see just a small child.

It may be that purely sexually-oriented paedophiles [as opposed to those who have been conditioned to abuse through enduring abuse themselves] perceive young children to be sexually attractive because they are unable to contextualise the aspects of size and age and even if they can, they may have other mental deficits that compromise appropriate decision-making abilities and/or a whole range of related deficits and, if just one of these potential deficits is what gives rise to this type of paedophilia, we owe it to our children to explore it and to try and work with it – which we won't be able to do while we believe in the twisted, hateful and self-righteous messages of the religions.

If paedophilia is actually an illness [and maybe even neurological as opposed to psychiatric] and if we accept paedophilia as an illness, we will then have the potential for actually finding a cure or at worst, for reducing its occurrence and of improving current rehabilitation programmes. If we continue to freely-choose to judge and condemn paedophilia as an 'evil' only, we will continue to deny ourselves the opportunity to protect our children - it's that simple. If you want to try to prevent any form of anti-social and/or abusive behaviour, stop judging and start learning. Put what you find to good use in any way you can [even if only by no longer judging such people as 'evil'] and we'll soon start to see a healthier and safer world for all of our children.

I conclude that paedophilia is a disease caused by early conditioning in children promoted by teenagers and adults who themselves may have been abused and who do not real-ise that they are actually abusing, as well as by those who do real-ise that they are abusing.

Even if not pre-conditioned to abuse, paedophiles may also not be able to contextualise and if they are pre-conditioned and without the ability to contextualise and we still freely choose to follow unquestioned religious indoctrination about a God who has no needs but who loves punishing, our children will continue to be abused in such ways.

I do not believe that exposure to paedophilic visual material alone creates a paedophile but, I do believe that exposure to such material for someone who may have been abused and/or with an inability to contextualise can strongly influence and encourage it. As a general theory, I believe that we are all a result of what we absorb [not just of what we eat] and so, exposure to such material for one who may be of a balanced mind may not by itself turn them into a paedophile but, the potential effects upon such a person can potentially result in depression, Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome and even suicide.

Ultimately and regardless of the potential causes and influences, it is the choice to engage sexually with children that creates a child abuser. Not all paedophilic-minded people choose to interact sexually with children and some instead choose to seek help. Not all teenagers or adults who were abused have become conditioned by their experience to then abuse others and, I believe a potentially worthy component of any rehabilitation would involve getting paedophiles to accept that even though what happened to them was not their fault, that it is now their responsibility. As such, they must not be persecuted and must instead be encouraged to take responsibility for what others may have done to them and to break the chain instead of continuing the cycle by passing their pain on to others but, we can not do this while society and the establishment treats such people simply and only as 'evil'.

Is a paedophile who has never engaged sexually with children and who seeks help really 'evil'? When you consider that the clinical definition of a paedophile is that of someone who believes that sexual interactions with children is okay, where does this leave those who refuse this notion? For example; not all people who download images relating to child porn agree that it is okay to have sex with children. There can be a variety of unsavoury psychological reasons for why such people may download such images but, this doesn't by default mean that these same people actually agree that sexual interactions with children are okay or, would actually engage sexually with children themselves. This issue is far more complex than politicians and the judiciary care to admit and while all they have to do to retain power over us is to pander to uneducated and ill-informed religious-oriented voters, we can only expect even more children to be abused.

There are also many adults who have been conditioned by their own direct childhood experience of abuse that this is not the way to treat children. For example; there are many boys [such as myself] who witnessed their mothers being beaten by a step-father and so who decided that this is not the way to treat women. For a child, the direct experience or witnessing of any form of abuse can be as much a deterrent as it can be an influence and, it is our own individual choices that play the biggest part in deciding which. We are not simply just carbon copies destined to commit to the same acts and attitudes of our parents because, we ALL have choice-making abilities and we ALL use them in every moment of our lives – regardless of whether we acknowledge this or not.

Even the Atheist's will say; *"Paedophiles are evil!"* yet will have no alternative theory when reminded that they don't believe in 'evil' and so, it is obvious that the social conditioning to simply hate and condemn child abusers and paedophiles as being purely 'evil' has worked amazingly. I have spent years trying to understand the mindset of such people and their behaviour in an attempt to find a way to prevent further proliferation and, it is also why you may rush to judge and condemn me and liken me to these people but, note that I am not justifying their beliefs or behaviours.

There is a world of difference between exploring, understanding and reasoning something compared to justifying something. In exploring, understanding and expressing the possible reasons for why I believe that terrorists and child abusers commit to the terrible acts that they do, I have not become one myself and I would never justify their actions. What I have become is responsible and for those who assume that it's easy for me to write from this perspective, please understand that it is actually because a child who I knew and loved was attacked by a predatory paedophile and that since 1999, I have also consistently witnessed the government's and court's conscious and willing failure to protect children.

5. The mainstream media [for inciting all of the above while protecting known abusers who are colleagues or parliamentarians].

Those 'moral' bastions of society who own and run the rags [and who now have no need to kill trees yet continue to do so in order to maximise their profit margins], have always been the fastest and loudest in inciting us to hate the "*evil paedophiles!*" Those who lie to you about your political options and who regularly deceive those who they interview think that they can tell you how to react to something – and they're right, they can!

How many people still buy Rupert Murdoch's lies even after knowing that his newspaper's staff hacked into the voice mail of murdered schoolgirl Milly Dowler as well as thousands of other innocent people? How many people cancelled their Sky TV or Netflix subscriptions in disgust? Fuck all!

In their drunken desire to satisfy their obsession with the sex lives of others, the UK people still support Rupert Murdoch and his media at any cost to our society and to the individuals that he maims along the way. The UK people, with their voyeuristic addictions and their imperialist and culturally-embedded desire to look down upon others, actually believe that the story lines in Coronation fucking Street are news – even to the point that actors regularly have to protect themselves from hostility when in public! The producers of such shows and people like Murdoch take no social responsibility but, they do take your money and they take it because you freely choose to give it to them. The 'Great' British public knowingly supports those who are shown to be corrupt, while believing itself to be occupying the high ground on all global issues but when it comes to the BBC, the UK comes into its own.

In 2012 the BBC was shown to be protecting employees who were known to be paedophiles, yet this disclosure has made no wholesale difference to the UK people. Many BBC celebrity employees have been found guilty of shocking, depraved and predatory acts towards children committed over a period of more than forty years, yet the UK people continue to signal that this is acceptable to them.

Panorama [broadcast 22nd Oct. 2012] finally revealed something of the true nature of the BBC; institutional protection of paedophiles, cover-ups, lies from senior editors [published in the public domain through BBC blogs], lies from the director-general [in written statements to his own staff and broadcast in TV press statements], scape-goating, internal investigations squashed, non-reporting of incidence of child abuse on-site, and victims intentionally taunted whilst abusers known to the BBC are praised by the BBC in Christmas tributes!

It was disclosed that the Newsnight feature that BBC managers and the BBC director-general have said was commissioned as an investigation specifically and only into Surrey Police's handling of accusations against Jimmy Savile, was in fact specifically and only commissioned to investigate Jimmy Savile himself. BBC managers said that the feature was dropped because it wasn't strong enough as Surrey Police had done no wrong but, we now know that it was dropped because it was in danger of damaging the BBC's reputation because it reveals a forty-year history of institutional child abuse, and its proliferation.

BBC director-general George Entwistle lied when he wrote to staff saying that the Newsnight investigation was about "*Surrey Police's inquiry into Jimmy Savile towards the end of 2011.*" We know this because Newsnight producer Meirion Jones immediately emailed Entwistle saying; "*George - one note - the investigation was into whether Jimmy Savile was a paedophile - I know because it was my investigation. We didn't know that Surrey Police had investigated Jimmy Savile - no-one did - that was what we found when we investigated and interviewed his victims.*"

As if this wasn't enough, all of the victims that the BBC had convinced to contribute to the feature, were then left having to instead endure seeing the BBC heap praise on Jimmy Savile in their Christmas schedule [2011], instead of broadcasting the feature

against Jimmy Savile - an intentional decision made by Entwistle after he knew the truth!

Entwistle also lied when he said that Christmas schedules could not be rearranged at short notice, as many within the BBC have since confirmed that this would have been a simple process and also, that Entwistle himself would have known how simple because he was once director of TV!

Entwistle admitted to the Commons Culture, Media and Sport Select Committee [23rd Oct. 2012] that Savile's alleged behaviour had been possible ONLY because of a "*broader cultural problem*" at the BBC. He says; "*We are looking at between five and ten serious allegations relating to activities over the whole period in question, the Savile period.*"

In a pathetic and patronising attempt to place the BBC as a bastion of justice, he said; "I would accept that there have been times when we have taken longer to do things than in a perfect world I would have liked, but I think if you looked at what we have achieved since the scale of the crisis became clear, I think you see we have done much of what we should have done and done it in the right order and with proper respect paid to the right authorities."

Entwistle [a former Newsnight editor himself who therefore knows the protocols] also faced criticism over the decision not to broadcast the Newsnight investigation when he himself was head of TV and, Newsnight editor Peter Rippon stepped aside [21st Oct. 2012] after the BBC said that his explanation [published via BBC blogs] as to why the show dropped its investigation into Savile was "*inaccurate or incomplete*" - confirming that the BBC needs time to calculate in which direction to continue lying! Why else can the BBC not specify now, if Peter Rippon's blog is either inaccurate, incomplete, or both?

The BBC never even had to answer as to why the Newsnight feature was dropped or why the Savile tributes were broadcast after learning that he was paedophile.

Conservative Culture Secretary Maria Miller confirmed that for Conservative politicians, finding out what actually happened and why the BBC decided not to broadcast what it knew is of less importance than protecting the BBC's image when she stated; "*full public trust in the BBC's inquiries into the Savile affair was of paramount importance.*" and it would be of more concern to Conservative politicians because the soul-less BBC is every government's mouth-piece!

BBC propaganda tells us that the BBC has integrity on the basis that it broadcast a program [Panorama] that criticised the BBC but, doing this was nothing more than damage limitation [it had no better options] because ITV broke the story first!

David Cameron insisted that; "*Every organisation that was involved with him, whether the NHS or whether the BBC, needs to get to the bottom of what happened.*" but, even though the Tory party was one of these organisations, it will never be truly independently questioned.

Add to this, that the NSPCC estimated that David Cameron reduced the budget for children's social care by 24% [Apr. 2011] and, that Community Care magazine's own survey concludes that "*Social workers are effectively being pressurised to ignore child abuse as a result of budget cuts.*" then David Cameron himself is also responsible for the proliferation of child abuse. I say this because it is known that direct cuts to this particular budget do result in increased and prolonged exposure to abuse and David Cameron would have been aware of this before making the decision [even if only through advice from policy aids].

Further to this, I add that David Cameron is also proliferating child abuse by allowing the law on child protection in schools to discriminate against Muslim children - leaving

them vulnerable to abuse from teachers where non-Muslim children aren't and, by leaving children open to abuses of privacy and dignity within school. Put simply, implementing both of these policies whilst reducing budgets that are in place to protect children from abuse, can only increase the proliferation of child abuse and David Cameron himself is directly responsible for the implementation of these policies.

It also came to light that a paedophile ring was in operation from within Ten Downing Street itself when under Margaret Thatcher! At the time, this was never investigated thoroughly and, it also appears that there was a major cover-up and even in 2012, Tom Watson [Labour Party deputy chairman] was having to fight tooth and nail to have this incident investigated.

In more accusations of abuse committed by Conservative party members and members of the police [regarding children who lived in a North Wales care home], it now seems that Conservative William Hague confined any police investigations into his colleague's criminal behaviour to examining ONLY incidents that occurred during the home where these children lived - despite the children saying that all criminal activity actually happened off-site! As accusations were also made against members of the police, the confinement of any investigations would also have been in their best interest too and so outside of state circles, who would ever have known and who would have supported these children? Even in 2012, former Conservative MP David Mellor publicly insulted sexual abuse victim Steven Messham by calling him "*a weirdo*"!

These are the psychopaths that you are never forced to vote for but always choose to and for those who've always bought into the BBC's propaganda that there are only ever three political options, why the fuck doesn't it ever occur to you to at least abstain en masse [communicated via the internet] so as to show a vote of no confidence in Parliament and the whole system itself?

It is the nature of parliamentary politics and of the state to use all available resources to silence accusers - even when the accusers are abused children crying out for help. This alone is child abuse and it was carried-out and covered-up by members of David Cameron's Conservative party. How many criminal friends, colleagues and associates does this man have to have before the people wake up and make a different choice? How any more children will continue to be abused while we choose to maintain a theocracy and don't even demand any form of democracy - never mind true direct democracy?

This is the same BBC that has been keeping quiet about David Cameron's support for the religious fatwa-enabled FSA child rapists in Syria and for the violently oppressive Bahraini, Saudi, Qatar and Kuwaiti Regimes and with pro-government people always being selected directly by the sitting government of the day to run the BBC Trust and with most editors currently being pro-Cameron, he will be getting full support because Chris Pattern [the former Chair] came-out in full defence of the BBC - when his job remit required that he remained completely independent and acts ONLY on behalf of the BBC licence payer!

David Cameron is also doing his best to close-down foreign broadcasters that have a UK reach so that his BBC mouthpiece gets more and more exposure and so that we get more and more dumbed-down. Voting for direct democracy is the only legitimate way to cleanse the system top-down and to fragment the relationship between the government and the mainstream media.

Government = Governo [to control] and Mentis [mind]

In 2013, my UNICEF-supported Inet Protect strategy was submitted directly to David Cameron and to various members of his inner circle but its implementation was

blocked without a single reason being stated and, David Cameron is aware of my previous history and success regarding the creation of internet-based child protection strategies. While in communication with directors at Yahoo in early 2014, I invited them [and many others] to fault Inet Protect on technical grounds but they couldn't and so, I can only assume that David Cameron blocked Inet Protect for political reasons.

Add to this that his long-term close friend and unelected Conservative Deputy Head of Government Policy Patrick Rock [who was implementing an inferior strategy that uses web filters] was himself investigated regarding sexual misconduct towards female colleagues and then later arrested [Feb. 2014] on charges relating to paedophilia and, that David Cameron quashed news about Patrick's misconduct and arrest, and it becomes clear that David Cameron prioritises protecting his inner-circle criminal friends and keeping quiet about the People's Administration and direct democracy, over any desire to protect children.

In early 2001 and while taking a break from the music industry due to illness, I created and submitted another internet-based child protection strategy but it was blocked by the state for "*political reasons*" and in my belief, due directly to Tony Blair's efforts to protect criminal banks, Labour Party members and other establishment members from arrest for crimes relating to child abuse.

While studying the links between various organised crime portals, I discovered how banks were equipping criminals [including paedophiles] with merchant trading accounts that enabled them to use on-line payment facilities. Using these facilities, they were then able to generate a revenue for themselves and the banks by selling membership subscriptions to child pornography websites that they themselves administered. Part of my strategy revolved around accessing various networks [legally or other] so as to obtain personal information about who these merchants were, who their paying subscribers were, and where they all lived.

Friends of mine at the time who were hackers years before the web was invented had created automated hacking tools for me to use specifically for this purpose and, I myself was a self-taught ZX Spectrum programmer at the age of thirteen. During further education, I qualified in Computer Science and Micro Electronics so as to be able to maintain my recording studio myself and to use as a back-up career and by pulling upon all of this, I created and submitted my strategy [in-person] but as soon as I mentioned how criminals were using on-line banking facilities, the conversation and the strategy were terminated for "political reasons" and, the strategy itself wasn't even explored.

Contrary to some conspiracy theories, my 2001 strategy was NOT blocked by any intelligence or secret service agencies and as far as I know, Tony Blair did NOT use a non-disclosure order [of any type] to gag the media regarding the reporting of convicted Labour Party and establishment members during this period. If no order was made, I suspect that the media were silent because in 1997 and for the first time ever, Rupert Murdoch had personally and publicly endorsed the Labour Party in a general election and so after the first arrest in 1998, he could have chosen to operate a news blackout simply to protect his own reputation and not to protect the party that betrayed him. The reasons for why the BBC and Channel 4 [a BBC division] could have operated a blackout could have been to avoid provoking parliamentarians because at that time, many of them knew about the BBC's own dark parallel culture but had not gone public about it. However, ITV was perfectly placed to report on these convictions and I question why ITV didn't report anything - especially if there wasn't a non-disclosure order in-place.

To summarise; with or without a non-disclosure order, a mainstream news blackout of

convicted Labour Party and establishment members benefited Rupert Murdoch and the BBC as much as it benefited Tony Blair, the Labour Party and the entire establishment.

Since 1998, multiple Labour Party activists, members, councillors, school governors, mayors, lords and MPs were convicted of horrific sex crimes against women and children [some even involving animals] but through media blackouts and through blocking on-line child protection strategies, Tony Blair had erected a state-wide shield which my strategy would have inadvertently penetrated. I believe that Tony Blair invaded Iraq in 2003 ONLY because Saddam Hussein suddenly stopped selling Iraqi oil through the US Dollar [the world's reserve currency] and, because it provided a great distraction from the arrest of establishment figures [his friends and colleagues] in the UK on charges relating to child abuse and child pornography because in 2002, the FBI picked-up on what I had discovered and ran a scaled-down version of my strategy.

It was known as Operation Ore and it became the world's largest joint police operation to-date and led to approx. 70,000 arrests and multiple suicides of criminals [some of them police personnel] and during my submission of Inet Protect in 2013, David Cameron was made aware of all of this. He was shown how the state's decision to block my 2001 strategy led directly to millions of children around the world being abandoned to their abusers and I specifically asked David not to repeat the previous decision that amounted to such a massive global proliferation of child abuse. However, while under the false impression that I wasn't legally able or willing to publicly disclose anything about what happened in 2001 and therefore also anything about my request to implement Inet Protect, David Cameron chose to block it. In addition, he also refused to launch an investigation into Tony Blair's decision in 2001 to deliberately leave abused children in danger by blocking my strategy on political grounds and, he refused to submit my information to the investigation into historic establishment-led child abuse cover-ups. In my belief, him making these decisions after working directly with Tony Blair at Ten Downing Street during 2012-2013 was not a coincidence because unknown to most, David Cameron was to some extent Tony Blair's prodigy.

Incidentally, when the FBI initially launched their investigation, the banks involved refused to co-operate to any degree and it was only after the FBI had secured court orders against them that Operation Ore could begin.

Tony Blair and David Cameron are both guilty of running child abuse cover-ups and of abandoning millions of abused and vulnerable children around the world just to benefit themselves and while David Cameron publicly fakes concern for the 5 million UK children who are bullied on-line every day, he privately chose to leave them vulnerable by blocking Inet Protect in 2013. Despite this, neither Tony Blair or David Cameron have committed any crimes and neither have they failed to discharge their sworn duties [the oath is extremely vague] but with my evidence, any MP can call for a vote of no confidence in David Cameron and this action could lawfully result in the removal of David Cameron from office with immediate effect. This in-turn would prompt an investigation into Tony Blair's previous activities too and only then, will the people know the truth about establishment-led child abuse cover-ups and the truth about the 'qualified' MPs and media organisations they freely empower.

To protect potential state witnesses from being scapegoated by David Cameron and Tony Blair, I will not be disclosing the names and positions of the people who directly blocked the strategy on Tony Blair's behalf. What I can disclose is that they were resentful and disappointed when blocking the strategy and it was evident that they wanted to explore any potential but felt they had no choice.

Incidentally, your freely-elected so-called 'qualified' MPs voted years ago to ban secret service and intelligence officers from disclosing information about any crimes committed by MPs and unelected Lords and Ladies [the core of the establishment] to

any 3rd party. As such, any officer who breaches this law will be tried for treason [in secret] and, it is due to this block that MPs are able to pressurise officers into undertaking unlawful practices because, officers [of any level] who refuse such orders have their jobs and pensions threatened and can't report any unlawful orders to anyone anyway. It is criminal MPs who break laws by ordering officers to commit to unlawful acts and obviously, no officer can disclose when MPs do this.

Although the state has non-disclosure orders in-place regarding some of my other political activities, both Tony Blair and David Cameron failed to secure non-disclosure orders against me regarding any of the above and, I feel that I have to publish my evidence into the public domain instead of submitting it to David Cameron's so-called 'investigation' [a whitewash] into historic establishment cover-ups of child abuse.

What happened to me in 2001 was one of the primary reasons for why I later established the PA and for why I continued to work intermittently on internet-based child protection strategies and child welfare policies independent of the state. As such, many of my policy proposals in the PA manifesto [particularly within Family Law and Child Protection, IT and Education] are potential solutions for all that I have since found [both on and off-line] and assessed as being harmful to children.

In my belief, submitting my evidence to the state would amount to an absolute betrayal of the millions of children who both Tony Blair and David Cameron have abandoned since 2001 and without knowing how or when I would achieve it, I made a silent promise to all of these children that I would one day avenge them. Since then, I chose to wait until I found what I felt would be the best way to do this and, to bring fundamental and sustainable change to the system that allowed for this proliferation of child abuse to happen. However, I didn't expect a repeat experience at the hands of a second Prime Minister years later.

Since 2001, I have acquired direct experience, knowledge and evidence regarding how every aspect of the state from the top down [except for the intelligence services] is involved in running child abuse cover-ups and, of how the mainstream media are complicit. Therefore, my accountability is to the people and not to the state and for reasons related to security, I have manually posted [so as to avoid tracing] evidence to multiple journalists and contacts based outside of the UK [in 2001, 2003, 2008 and 2014] with instructions to publish in certain circumstances and, the UK Electoral Commission has also been fully informed and has witnessed that I am now disclosing my evidence into the public domain.

I believe that my strategy in 2001 was blocked by the state so as to protect criminal banks and criminal members of the establishment and that Inet Protect was blocked in 2013 because a web without child abusers and terrorists is a web that doesn't need mass state surveillance and at any cost, David Cameron wants to maintain inefficient blanket surveillance of all citizens instead of targeted surveillance of suspects only - even if it means that abuse and terrorism is left to thrive and that children are left to suffer.

The people who Tony Blair, Rupert Murdoch, the BBC, others within the establishment and now David Cameron are protecting from mainstream public exposure are as follows:

1998:

Cllr. Nicholas Green [Mayor]

- Convicted on 3 counts of rape and 13 counts of indecent assault on girls aged between 6 and 10 years old. He also raped a woman on her wedding day. Jailed for 10 years.

1999:

Terry Power - Arrested and charged with committing sex attacks on boys. Forced to resign only.

2001:

Martyn Locklin [local party member on first name terms with Tony Blair]

- Convicted on 8 counts of rape and indecent assault of teenage boys. The judge told Locking "You will be watched for the rest of your life. You need to be!"

2002:

Mark Tan [Prominent Labour activist in Kent]

- Convicted for sexually assaulting a girl of 9 and of raping a 4 year old girl on two separate occasions. Jailed for 15 years.

Cllr. Stuart Brown [Mayor]

- Admitted downloading thousands of images of hardcore child pornography and distributing - some of images of children as young as 4 years old. Walked free from court.

2003:

Cllr. Keith Rogers

- Convicted for downloading over 2000 images of hardcore child pornography. Placed on the Sex Offenders Register.

Neil Redrup

- Convicted for setting up a secret camera in his bathroom to film women and, was also found guilty of gross indecency in relation to showing hardcore pornography to a child.

Cllr. Greg Vincent [school governor]

- Convicted for possession of hardcore child pornography featuring children as young as 8 years old. One of the images featured a girl of 10 who was tied up and beaten. Given a 2 year rehabilitation order.

2004 onwards:

Cllr. Gilbert Benn

- Found guilty of child molestation.

Cllr. Paul Diggert

- Found guilty of grooming under-age girls for sex and for downloading hardcore child pornography.

Cllr. Joseph Shaw

- Found guilty of Downloading hardcore child pornography.

Cllr. Alen Prescott

- Found guilty of child molestation committed in the 'care' home where he worked.

Cllr. Keith Potts [school governor]

- Found guilty of Downloading hardcore child pornography

Cllr. Alec Dyer-Atkins [school governor]

- Convicted for downloading over 42,000 images and films that were described in court as "horrifying images of child abuse." Also a member of the Shadows

Brotherhood paedophile ring. Jailed for 2 years.

Cllr. David Spooner

- Found guilty of masturbating in front of two young boys. Jailed for 1 year.

Peter Tuffley [Labour Party member and Hazel Blears' personal assistant who also worked for Barnardos and the NSPCC]

- Convicted for grooming of a 13 year old boy. Jailed for 15 months.

Tony Page

- 2 convictions for gross indecency in public toilets.

Rab Knox

- Convicted for committing a horrific sexual assault. Jailed for 3 years.

Cllr. Lestyn Tudor Davies

- Convicted for the multiple rape of a 9 year old girl. Jailed for 7 years and placed on the Sex Offenders register for life.

Cllr. Lee Benson

- Found guilty for 12 counts of possession of indecent images of children aged between 5 and 11 years old.

Cllr. Peter Swainston [Mayor] - Found guilty of gross indecency in a public toilet.

Cllr. Sam Choudhary [Mayor]

- Convicted of multiple sex attacks on girls as young as 5 years old.

Cllr. Nelson Bland

- Convicted on 16 counts of possessing child pornography [stored on his daughter's computer]. The images were found after he was investigated by police in relation to a murder enquiry.

Cllr. Raymond Coates

- Him and his son were both found guilty of child rape and, of attempting to force a woman to have sex with an animal.

Cllr. George Harding

- Charged with indecent assault on a 12 year old girl.

Cllr. Les Sheppard

- Convicted on 10 counts of indecent assault on girls aged between 9 and 13 years old. Jailed for 2 years.

Cllr. Liam Temple [Mayor]

- Found guilty of inciting a 12 year old girl into committing an act of gross indecency.

Yusef Azad [Labour Party member - Greater London Assembly]

- Found guilty of subscribing to hardcore child pornography sites.

If you continue to vote for psychopaths who continually block proven child protection strategies created by more-experienced outsiders who in this area, were years ahead of UK and US intelligence agencies, then expect more damaged children but don't blame Parliament for your freely-made choices to betray democracy [rule of the people] and children, in-place of electing so-called 'representatives' [which the Greek inventors of democracy NEVER did]. If these are the sort of people who you align

yourself with and who you therefore want to represent you, keep voting and reap!

6. Parliament [for implementing policies that expose children to abuse and for its continued refusal to recognise Parental Alienation and Parental Kidnap as crimes against children].

By January 2014, the following policies had been implemented or blocked by David Cameron and the other freely-elected members of Parliament on behalf of the UK people:

- Invasion of children's privacy [headline news outside the EU and US]

In allowing foreign regimes to store, access and redistribute our children's personal and private communications, David Cameron took it upon himself to deny every UK parent their right and ability to protect their child's privacy and has therefore made UK children vulnerable to abuse.

Up to eight hundred and fifty thousand staff from various intelligence agencies and corporates in the US will do what ever they like with the information that they now have access to because, it was impossible for David Cameron or anyone to give any meaningful guarantee of data protection. With such a betrayal, what will prevent any of these people from potentially selling our children's personal information to criminal networks that would seek to exploit it?

Where is our guarantee that our children will not one day receive a blackmail threat regarding their private communications? Where is our guarantee that our children will not be penalised by potential employers because of something they did at school one day? Are our children now criminals simply because they expected a right to privacy [as hypocritical Tory Theresa May suggests]?

Example scenario:

An already-vulnerable young girl sends an email, sends an SMS or makes a phone call to her trusted friend where she explains about her experience of being abused. The nature of her communication is private and personal and is NOT criminal but on top of her abuse, she will now be dealing with the knowledge that her 'private' [and non-criminal] communication will be seen by up to eight hundred and fifty thousand strangers in the US.

A further concern I have regards the implications of vulnerable children now knowing that so-called 'anonymous' help lines have been recording their telephone conversations [content] along with their telephone numbers [meta data], making them personally identifiable. From this point onwards, how can any vulnerable child ever trust in such services and, how can any parent ever trust in so-called 'representative' politics?

- Children's legal rights to privacy [UK slammed by UNCRRC]

Even BEFORE allowing David Cameron to disclose ALL of your children's 'private' communications to 3rd parties, the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child had concluded that the UK was still falling well short of the obligations that it signed-up to regarding the protection of the rights of children and therefore, that the UK has since continued to break international law regarding the protection of children.

Their latest report concludes that;

"The UK is not doing enough to protect children's privacy or to uphold the best interests of the child. The principle of the best interests of the child is still not reflected as a primary consideration in all legislative and policy matters affecting children and called for the development of a British Bill of Rights, which incorporates the principles and provisions of the Convention. Failure to implement fully the

Convention rights, especially the best interests of the child principle, in all policy areas remains a concern of the Committee."

In particular, the Committee is highly critical about the treatment of children in the criminal justice, care, education and immigration services.

- Children open to abuses of privacy and dignity at school

The Education Bill [published on the 27th Jan. 2011] removes every child's right to privacy in primary and secondary schools and colleges by giving staff powers to search for prohibited items without consent. The law is also to be amended so that a member of staff can search a child alone without another adult being present and, male members of staff will be permitted to search girls and female members of staff permitted to search boys.

As if this wasn't perverse enough, staff are also to be given powers to erase private personal data on children's phones, laptops and all other privately-owned electronic equipment and I believe that with this policy, the coalition and Parliament demonstrate a near-fascist mind set that threatens the personal security of children whilst invading and interfering in their private lives - all without consent or without parents being present!

Children's Rights Alliance [CRAE] national co-ordinator Carolyne Willow says; *"Ministers have not produced a shred of evidence for these draconian powers. We're told the coalition government wants to create an education system that is world-class. This shameful Bill tells children they have no right to expect privacy and dignity in school. That school staff are to be allowed to erase any personal data on electronic devices without any discussion with children or their parents is more akin to treatment in totalitarian regimes than a modern democracy."*

- Spending for children's welfare slashed by 24% in Cameron's first budget

The NSPCC estimates that David Cameron reduced the budget for children's social care by 24% [Apr. 2011] and, Community Care magazine's own survey concludes that *"Social workers are effectively being pressurised to ignore child abuse as a result of budget cuts."* It is known that direct cuts to this particular budget do result in increased and prolonged exposure to abuse and both David Cameron and George Osborne would have been aware of this before making the decision [even if only through advice from policy aids].

- UK's army of unsupported child carers

As of January 2014, the UK had approximately one hundred and eighty thousand child carers – Ten thousand children aged five to seven now care for adults and, completely unsupported!

- UK funding illegal forced child sterilisation programme in India [headline news outside the EU and US]

Through David Cameron, the UK taxpayer is funding the forced sterilisation of schoolgirls in India [which often leads to death] and, the UN has actually stated that this is highly illegal but, it gets even worse - the UK government is actually overseeing this programme and, it has actually stated that reducing the Indian population is part of a strategy to 'help' India to reduce its carbon emissions.

The abuse and murder of innocent foreign schoolgirls, a constant [and completely unnecessary] hunger for oil, a new addiction to fracking and, continued and complete subservience to the US government and the men behind it - all from the man who peddled protecting the environment along with statements about the UK needing a government that would stand independent of the US, while lying about giving *"more*

power to the man in the street." - which through the language of austerity translates into *"more financial responsibility to the man in the street."* [the so-called 'Big Society'].

- Cameron-backed 'rebels' using fatwa to rape children [headline news outside the EU and US]

On the 4th of April 2013, the men who David Cameron and Western governments have been supporting in Syria [the FSA] and who he wants to arm to the teeth, requested permission from a Saudi Islamic preacher to be able to use an Islamic ruling to 'justify' the gang rape of civilian supporters [voters] of their enemy President Assad. This was granted in the form of a fatwa and their campaign had already begun by around mid-2013.

With our blessing expressed through our inaction and tax payments, David Cameron openly supports an armed minority Islamic Sharia insurgency that is now violating too many laws to mention and, which now openly commits war crimes on a daily basis while openly going against the Qur'an itself.

The fatwa is introduced as coming from the Saudi preacher Mohammed al-Arifi and specifies that it comes into force to address the *"sexual problems of the Mujahideen."* By re-branding the fatwa into a document to address sexual rather than military issues, the fatwa will be able to exploit the requirement of Islamic women's sexual 'duties' towards men [and their associated punishments for non-compliance] and the fatwa therefore becomes compliant with Sharia. A fatwa issued to attack women and children [or any non-combatant] in any circumstance that relates to military combat would be un-Islamic.

The specifics of the fatwa are as follows:

1. Syrian fighters may engage in a marriage called 'intercourse marriage'.
2. Intercourse marriage shall last for a few hours so Syrian females can give each fighter a turn.
3. This is the duty of a Syrian women because intercourse marriage boosts the determination of the Mujahideen [despite these women being supportive of President Assad and not the Mujahideen].
4. Those females who enter into intercourse marriage [by use of force obviously] shall enter paradise on the condition that they be at least fourteen years of age, widows or divorced [meaning that if the FSA choose to rape a woman or girl who doesn't conform to their own fatwa, then as is the way of Islamic male-invented Sharia law, she will be punished by Allah for her 'crimes' against Islamic men - if she isn't publicly executed by her assailants first].

- Policy that discriminates against the welfare of Muslim children

I believe that UK law is failing to protect children who study in Islamic faith schools from serious physical, mental and psychological assault at the hands of Imams who indoctrinate using the violent Deoband syllabus [approximately 80% of all UK Imams]. Children as young as six years of age are regularly kicked and punched [as Channel 4's Dispatches program highlighted on the 14th Feb. 2011] and UK law allows this providing that the attacks leave no marks. This is an exception to how child protection laws are applied to every other state and faith school in the UK.

UK law is currently leaving approximately one hundred thousand Muslim children open to this form of abuse while David Cameron pro-actively encourages the establishment of yet more 'private' schools and, the UK taxpayer will be part-contributing to the funding of these schools too.

All of the Islamic faith schools that were seen to be administering violence had all repeatedly passed government inspections and so the government is part-responsible for the regular persecution of Muslim children. David Cameron is appeasing the Muslim extremists and all of society will reap the whirlwind - especially Islamic children who are currently growing up disintegrated from UK society.

- £2 BN aid deal for Somalia blocked [no reason given]

David Cameron blocked my proposal [submitted directly on the 26th July 2011] to take as little as £2 BN from the frozen UK-based bank accounts of former North African dictators [with the permission of the NTC in Libya and the representatives of Tunisia and Egypt] to use to end the Somali famine with immediate effect.

I even suggested that the transitional leadership of all three countries would probably be very grateful for the opportunity to make a gesture of appreciation for the recent Western support by way of assisting their fellow Muslim brothers and sisters in their own continent.

- Refusal to recognise Parental Alienation and Parental Kidnap as crimes against children

Parental Alienation and Parental Kidnap infringe upon the rights of the child to know of its parentage and also exposes the child to potential emotional difficulties in later life, if the child is ever reconciled with the truth. Parental Alienation and Parental Kidnap serves only the emotional desires and wishes [not needs] of the custodial spouse, over the rights, needs and well-being of both the child and of the absent spouse and so, this is not prioritising the protection and the well-being of the child and is therefore in my opinion, a direct form of legalised child abuse.

- Cameron ends ALL funding for child rape, assault and trauma victims [headline news outside the EU and US]

David Cameron is to starve child welfare services across the UK of £30 BN before the beginning of 2016. The budgets that will be affected fund the care and rehabilitation of up to 1 million of the UK's most abused and traumatised children [specifically victims of stabbings, shootings and rapes] but, with those who could make a difference currently being too wrapped-up in hating benefit 'scroungers', the UK's adults are not likely to even blink an eyelid at news of cuts to this budget.

David Cameron's decision will ensure that not one penny will go towards funding the care of these children [who are supposed to be our future] and, many groups that rely on funding and donations are already saying that their organisations will collapse almost over-night.

- Refusal to implement policy that educates children about pornography and sexuality in relationships

In refusing to amend the child sex education curriculum to include pornography and sexuality in relationships, the UK Parliament is leaving vulnerable young boys and girls in danger of becoming both potential abusers and victims. Through conditioning, young boys are learning and normalising forms of sexual attitudes and behaviours that are generally abusive to young girls, who then in turn also become conditioned into accepting these behaviours as part of a 'normal' sexual interaction.

I believe that if children were aware of the difference between the terms erotica and pornography, that there would be an overall decline in female sexual abuse combined with a maturing of male sexual attitudes towards women and I say this because I believe that whilst children become more and more conditioned into perceiving pornography as 'normal' and mainstream, both young boys and girls become further desensitised to the effects of sexual abuse.

Simply using server-based filters to block 'porn' will not change sexual attitudes or the reasons for how children become vulnerable and instead, will continue to leave them open to the conditioning that I believe leads to abuse because, children will find ways around filters [both legal and illegal porn sites will still be available on-line and accessible through alternative connections and media] and also because they will be blocked from access to sexual education resources, advice sites, or any site that mentions sexual terms in its text but that does not host sexually explicit content.

Is the government now also going to filter television programming in-line with its Internet policy or will this still be the responsibility of parents? Until the government itself learns of the difference between the two terms and adopts more complex and meaningful measures, anything served-up will be purely gestures.

For example; more than half of women surveyed [independently] now believe that it is possible for a woman to be 'asking' to be raped and in my opinion, it is twisted, sexist, rapist-supporting law court judges [such as prominent colleague of David Cameron MP Eric Pickles] who have contributed the most towards this attitude-shift by allowing for 'mitigating circumstances' [rape myths] in rape cases. During his time as a judge and in one infamous case, Pickles actually told a woman and her 12-year old daughter who had both been raped by the same attacker, that they had asked for it because they were both wearing skirts. This man is a freely-elected so-called 'representative' of the Tory brand, a 'pillar' of the community and a man who supposedly stands for family values [unless you wear a skirt of course or do anything to assert your sexuality as a woman]. He is one of those many men who believes that a man is not responsible for his actions if he is influenced or provoked by someone else [even if by a 12-year old girl, which is very alarming when you consider that paedophiles also do not distinguish between an adult's and a child's expressions, often claiming that sexual interactions with children are okay if they ask for it]. Provocations, influences and actions expressed by others do not remove the ability of men to make independent choices [men blaming women for how they themselves freely choose to react and behave is not just an issue within Islam].

The word pornography is Greek and is defined specifically as being; 'The degradation of a woman through a sexual act'. Sexually explicit material that does not feature the degradation of a woman through a sexual act is not pornography and is actually erotica [another Greek term] - as is for example men performing sexual acts with other men because, material featuring homosexual acts is not pornography unless it also features the degradation of a woman through a sexual act.

If a young schoolboy's curiosities in sex and women are researched on-line, he will be learning from a false impression of women's sexuality because he will most likely be accessing pornographic sites, not erotica sites. I therefore believe he would be more likely to re-enact what he sees in such ways when with girls and, he may not even realise that he is being abusive if his on-line sex education makes up for the bulk of his overall sex education.

If the re-enactment starts early and is therefore done with young girls, this then presents a second form of conditioning [along-side that of the pornographic sites themselves] that can potentially programme young girls to believe that abuse within a sexual context is acceptable and therefore - not abuse, just as many women now think that rape is not abuse because it can be 'asked for'.

As well as publishing degrading sexual visual and audio content, legal pornographic sites also use language associated with such attitudes and so you will find such sites littered with terms such as "*slag*", "*whore*", "*bitch*", "*ho*", "*slapper*" etc, where erotica sites will use no such terms. How many schoolgirls now regularly use these terms with each other - without it being a gesture of disrespect? I absolutely believe that the root

cause for why such sexually degrading terms have become normalised is due to a lack of distinction between the definitions of pornography and erotica.

In May 2012, the mainstream media reported that in some UK cities, schoolgirls as young as eleven years 'expect' to have to 'go down' on rows of boys. I believe that this has happened because some legal pornographic sites contain content of this nature but, using consenting adults who are acting. However, adolescent schoolboys are not going to be able to re-enact what they see in such videos with assertive female porn stars. I believe that these young girls expect to have to partake in such acts because they have become conditioned to do so by adolescent boys who have been exposed to pornography [instead of erotica] and, by young girls accessing pornographic sites also, therefore exposing themselves to the same conditioning from the same legal pornographic sites that young boys are exposing themselves to. How else is any of this becoming normalised?

These differences in content between the two types of sites also means that it is potentially very easy to develop filtration software that can filter-out pornographic sites while allowing erotica and other sexually-oriented sites [such as advice sites] but, whilst the mainstream media continue to blur the line between the terms porn and erotica [as they do with the terms justify and reason] to suit their own political agendas, we will not see this happen and so young women and children will continue to suffer in this way until the people take responsibility and vote for direct democracy.

Put simply, whether it's through corrupt religious-influenced family laws, through inadequate advice given to parents and children by the state about sexually explicit material coupled with a sex education system that is still largely based upon only human reproductive education and that doesn't go far enough in educating about specific sexual acts and their implications [both emotional and physical], through court welfare officers being secretly ordered by Whitehall to come down on the side of the mothers in ALL disputes regardless [thanks to Tony Blair and as yet, unchanged by his friend David Cameron] or, through our freely-elected 'leaders' secretly giving away our children's private communications data to 3rd parties in other countries, the state refuses to protect our children. This is the reason for how and why it is not true that the well-being of the child is of paramount importance because to the state, if securing a child's well-being involves the family courts having to do or consider anything that they are not already accustomed to [such as accepting witness statements from 3rd parties in contact centres, or removing undemocratic religious laws from common law], then it just won't happen.

With all of the above taken into account, the ONLY social justice and protection that UK children will ever get will be the justice that parents install themselves because, the state will not challenge the twenty six unelected Christian Bishops who have been given a permanent place in the House of Lords so, if you want to protect your children, take full responsibility, do it yourself and do not trust the state because the state has other priorities [such as hindering the development of justice in court in order to protect undemocratic religious-influenced laws that abuse children's human and civil rights] and as for the police, it's a postcode lottery. South Yorkshire Police refused to prioritise child protection above social cohesion and through this inverted racism, over 1400 young girls [often multiple gang rape victims] who submitted hard evidence were intentionally ignored and left abandoned over a sixteen year period. Their boss [Shaun Wright] refused to resign until a few weeks later and as he was an elected commissioner, he couldn't be shifted by anyone [David Cameron blocked Zac Goldsmith's vote for recall in Feb. 2014]. In August 2014, the UK became the first country in the world to be known for having an acknowledged proliferator of child abuse running a police force and, with no protest from any of his force members.

An ill-informed and arrogant David Cameron, his friends in government and his entire

current inner-circle are so out of their depth with issues of this nature because they have no direct legal experience of any of it and so are ill-equipped. They consciously reject strategies and policies that could reduce child abuse and, they are also staunch supporters of Christian religious laws being a component of common law.

After celebrating Christmas 2011 with Rupert Murdoch's subordinates, David Cameron announced that he wants the UK to become "*more Christian*". How will non-Christians integrate into this and, will they therefore have less democratic rights? Why would our Prime Minister want for the religious persuasion of the UK to be in alignment with Christianity if we don't live in a Christian theocracy? Personal individual religious belief systems are not supposed to be part of his remit!

The state and the religions are not interested in protecting children and so schools can't even start to educate children about sexual attitudes along with reproductive education, hence my proposal to distinguish between pornography and erotica.

Out of the two genres, it is only ever pornographic sites [often legal] that are networked [however directly or indirectly] to sites and portals that host illegal sexual content. Even if legal and with consenting adult actors, the nature of the degrading material hosted on legal pornographic sites is closely aligned with the nature of the material hosted on illegal sites [it often mimics it], and so this linkage is no coincidence.

7. Custodial parents who use Parental Alienation and/or Parental Kidnap

Whilst neither Parental Alienation or Parental Kidnap are recognised as crimes against children by UK courts, it is not illegal for a spouse to be able to alienate the absent spouse or abuse the rights of the child, by conditioning the child into believing that the absent spouse is not the parent or, was a bad parent or, that another man is the father.

Parental Alienation and Parental Kidnap infringe upon the rights of the child to know of its parentage and also exposes the child to potential emotional difficulties in later life if the child is ever reconciled with the truth. Parental Alienation and Parental Kidnap serves only the emotional desires and wishes [not needs] of the custodial parent over the rights, needs and well-being of both the child and of the absent parent and so, this is not prioritising the protection and the well-being of the child and is therefore in my opinion, a direct form of legalised child abuse.

UK common law still refuses to recognise a man as a father unless he was wed [a religious ceremony] to the mother at the time of conception and this is the only reason for why men have always had to first fight for the right to be recognised as a father by UK common law before they can even attempt to secure any access rights for their children. This corruption is then amplified when the state then holds unrecognised fathers to account if they fail to pay maintenance [for example] where if this is the case, the state has no issue in recognising a man as a father and doesn't even ask for any proof of paternity [birth certificates have never been legal proof of paternity].

The state has much to hide regarding corruption within family law and child welfare so, gagging orders are standard in family-related disputes that involve children so as to protect the courts and their corruption. It is not done to protect the child's identity [which is the excuse still given] because, if family courts care so much just to protect a child's identity, then they would care even more to protect the child from anything more harmful such as Parental Alienation and Parental Kidnap [which they actually support if committed by the mother and is in my view, the reason for why Parental Kidnap in the UK has risen by over 80% during the last ten years]. That's over 80% more children growing up being wilfully lied to regarding why their father isn't around

and, with the full support of the courts that state that mothers actually have the legal right to do this because unlike the US and Europe, the UK refuses to acknowledge that Parental Alienation and Parental Kidnap are harmful to children. It is a coincidence that the US and UK are the ONLY countries in the world to have legalised kidnap if committed by mothers or by the state!

They deny the existence of the effects upon the child and, with the full knowledge that child psychologists across the UK completely disagree with this policy specifically because of the harmful effects to the child - such as having to endure the effects of neglect brought about through Parental Alienation and Parental Kidnap. In these cases, custodial parents have no option other than to lie to their children about why their father [even if proven innocent of any malicious accusations] isn't around, leaving them in a vulnerable state which in many children leads to depression, bulimia, suicide attempts and many other conditions and, the courts have been fully aware of this for decades. For example; if the mother [as the custodial parent] wilfully begins to programme the child to wrongly believe that another man is the child's father or, to programme the child to refer to the father as "*Stephen*" [for example], and not "*dad*", the courts will state that she has the legal right to do all of this and when asked about the harmful effects to the child, they will refuse to justify or even reason their stance and instead, will immediately threaten a father with prison for contempt of court if he asks again and the same if he threatens to disclose any of this information in relation to a specific case.

On Father's Day 2011 [of all days], David Cameron told the country that "*Absent fathers should be stigmatised like drink-drivers.*" In his hypocrisy, he adds that; "*leaving single mothers, who do a heroic job against all odds, to fend for themselves simply isn't acceptable.*" refusing to acknowledge the many cases of Parental Alienation and Parental Kidnap committed by mothers in the UK every day and, ignoring the plight of the many men who have been relegated to being no more than a gagged sperm donor.

- Common symptoms of Parental Alienation in adults:
 - Conditioning the child to refer to the targeted parent in name as anything other than mum/dad. At present, when addressing this particular aspect with regards to how this can affect the child, UK family court judges and politicians state that it is the choice of the custodial parent to do this if they so choose. More importantly, when questioned about why they continually ignore all of the advice from child psychologists that states the dangers to the child in the custodial parent doing this, they remain silent in their corruption and refuse to answer.
 - Supporting or encouraging the child's refusal to visit the targeted parent without reason
 - Refusing to attend mediation services provided by the courts [there is no penalty for custodial parents who refuse to attend and very little for those who ignore court orders awarded against them]
 - Allowing the child to choose whether or not to visit the targeted parent when a court has not empowered the custodial parent or the child to make that choice
 - Telling the child about why the marriage failed and giving them the details about the divorce settlement
 - Refusing the targeted parent access to medical and school records or schedules of extracurricular activities
 - Blaming the targeted parent for not having enough money, changes in lifestyle or other problems whilst in the presence of the child

- Refusing to acknowledge the child has personal property and denying the child control over taking personal possessions to the targeted parent's home
- Rigid enforcement of the visitation schedule purely to get-back at the targeted parent
- Failure to adhere to court orders
- Preventing or restricting access
- Preventing the targeted parent from fulfilling their duties and desires as a responsible parent
- Denying the targeted parent the opportunity to be able to protect the child in any way that a parent deemed fit to parent, would so choose
- Assuming and expressing that the targeted parent may be dangerous because he or she had made threats in the past during an argument
- False allegations against the targeted parent of sexual abuse, drug and alcohol use or other illegal activities by the custodial parent
- Asking the child to choose one parent over the other
- Reminding the child they have good reason to feel angry towards the targeted parent
- Suggesting adoption or changes in name should a parent remarry
- Giving the child reasons for feeling angry toward the targeted parent, even when they have no memory of the incident that would provoke the feeling and, especially when they cannot remember the incident or reasons for being angry themselves
- Special signals, secrets, words with unique meanings or a private rendezvous arranged between the child and the custodial parent
- An intention to use the child as a witnesses against the targeted parent
- Asking the child to spy or covertly gather information to be used against the targeted parent
- Setting up temptations, distractions and/or obstacles that interfere with visitation
- Giving the child the impression having a good time on a visit will hurt the custodial parent
- Asking the child about the targeted parent's personal life
- 'Rescuing' the child from the targeted parent when there is no danger

- Common symptoms of Parental Alienation in children:

Listed below is how the custodial parent's behaviour impacts upon the child's behaviour or attitudes towards the targeted parent. If Parental Alienation influences the child against the targeted parent, the observer will see symptoms of Parental Alienation Syndrome.

For example; if a child doesn't appear to have a problem with visits, one can safely conclude Parental Alienation Syndrome is not severe or present. That is not to say Parental Alienation is not occurring [over time, the child may display severe symptoms of Parental Alienation Syndrome]. Often children appear healthy until asked about the targeted parent. Some of the behaviours an observer can expect to see in Parental Alienation Syndrome in children include:

- A relentless hatred for the targeted parent
- Parroting the custodial parent

- Refusing to visit or spend any time with the targeted parent
- Having many beliefs about the targeted parent mixed-up with those of the custodial parent
- Holding delusional or irrational beliefs
- Not being intimidated by or not respecting the court's authority
- Reasons for not wanting to have a relationship with the targeted parent based only on what the custodial parent tells the child
- The child not giving the targeted parent the benefit of the doubt
- Difficulty distinguishing between personal memories and what the child was told
- No ambivalence in a child's feelings - feeling only hatred without the ability to see any positive in the targeted parent
- No capacity to feel guilty about behaviour towards the targeted parent or to forgive any past indiscretions
- Sharing the custodial parent's cause to attack and dismiss the relationship
- Hatred extending to the targeted parent's extended family without any guilt or remorse

8. The UK electorate [for not prioritising children's welfare].

Ultimately, I hold the UK electorate responsible for ALL forms of child abuse and its proliferation because, all of the previously-mentioned 7 aspects can only happen with the consent of the electorate [the largest stake-holder in our society].

The one obvious trait that all neglectful parents have in common is their choice to continually put their own desires above their own child's needs. This makes neglectful parents easy to spot and so if children suffer neglect, it is due to ALL of us and not just due to neglectful parents themselves.

When the 'Great' British public continues empowering the BBC after learning of its protection of paedophiles, continues empowering Rupert Murdoch's News Corp media [The Sun, The Sun on Sunday, Sky etc] after News Corp were found guilty of committing the most profound violations of public trust [which even included violating the privacy and respect of a murdered schoolgirl], decides that it is okay [by not withdrawing custom] for HSBC to be funding Al'Qaeda and laundering drug money, how is the UK not funding its own oppression?

Even after a serving CIA officer [Edward Snowden] confirmed that the safety and well-being of UK children has been severely compromised and, after whistle-blowing CIA and NSA directors have stated that the only thing that the people of the UK and US can do to protect themselves against the formation of a Police Surveillance State is to "*sack the government*", UK parents take no formal action whatsoever regarding how David Cameron has shared their children's 'private' communications with up to eight hundred and fifty thousand strangers in the US!

The 'Great' British people continue to vote with their money [as they did with continued spending at McDonald's AFTER it was disclosed in the 1980's that they were funding the IRA], and with their ballot in general elections for continued oppression and so with this in mind, why does the UK population complain and protest about the effects of its own decisions?

UK survey [end of 2013]:

Biggest concern = immigration and the economy

Smallest concern = the environment

The reality according to environmental and economic scientists:

Biggest threat = the environment

Biggest aid to economy = immigration

Conclusion:

The UK's racially-oriented fears [incited mostly by the Conservatives and UKIP 'leaders'] of a non-existent threat are of more importance than the future well-being of every child, animal and plant [whose choices are never considered] on this planet.

Despite most British people saying that they are pro-democracy [pro-rule of the people], the most common objection to direct democracy from British people is a concern that the majority may vote for laws that they themselves wouldn't want, preferring that a corrupt parliament retains control of their lives instead and, whilst we perceive compromise to be an act of weakness, we will never have unity or be at peace. Compromise is an act of strength because to compromise is to sacrifice and to do this with awareness takes consideration for others and courage - traits that in my opinion the people of self-titled 'Great' Britain possess, but are not expressing. If for any reason you do not wish for your fellow countrymen to make policy decisions, then it is not democracy that you want because Democracy means 'rule of the people', not 'rule of the state' or of any other minority.

In my view, the culture that claims to be experiencing an awakening is still asleep because when it is awake, it lives in a false sense of positivity where it believes that focusing ONLY on one's self and increasing one's own positivity is enough alone to change the world for the better but, this is simply a comfortable delusion that allows the corrupt to push ahead with their agendas [of complete control] because even though you may not be interested in influencing and controlling politics, politics is definitely interested in controlling you.

Regarding this false sense of positivity, within 36 hours of setting-up on Twitter, David Cameron collected over 2 million followers - with approximately 70% of them following simply to insult him. When given the chance to vote for direct democracy on Twitter so as to legitimately, democratically and peacefully take complete control of all policy decision-making with immediate effect [sanctioned by both the Electoral Commission and the UN], the people of 'Great' Britain choose to waste their time and energy insulting David Cameron instead.

Many people say that it is actually me who holds a negative outlook but, if I have an awareness that something isn't working with our political system [which these same people also share] and, I have created a potential solution [unlike these 'positive' types] that requires that all you have to do to attain it is to click a few buttons, then the delusion can only be with those who criticise me and who judge themselves to be living a positive and conscious lifestyle, yet who do nothing to effect real change for all because, this type of 'positivity' improves the lifestyle of the beholder only.

It would be far more strategic for single-issue protest groups to vote for a reform to direct democracy now, than it would be to continue with begging, fighting the police, and other indirect action.

We teach our children that violence solves nothing while sending our adults to fight in wars simply because our so-called 'representatives' continually fail to address the fears of both themselves and of others. They fail to see that the true motives of our 'enemies' are only ever fear and/or revenge [pain] and instead they see 'evil'. 'Evil' is a purely religious notion [its existence has not been established as a scientific fact] and without realising, our freely-elected politicians project this religious notion of 'evil' upon others, making it their reality. Based upon this false reality, they then start wars with or without our permission and, they don't need or want our permission because

they are religious and the UK is a theocracy and is not a democracy.

'Great' British pride stems mostly from our past empire building [which included the rape and pillage of other civilisations] and things that we haven't actually had a hand in achieving like for example; being born in Britain. Pride is based purely upon how we think others perceive us and is not based upon how we perceive ourselves, where self-respect is based purely upon what we actually think of ourselves - regardless of the opinions of others.

To summarise; Pride will see a man choose to starve to death while self-respect will see him eat food from the floor and whether culturally, politically or militarily, England has invaded over 90% of the world's countries [more than any other].

It was similar 'Great' British imperial thinking that has led to the closure of many high street retailers who in the 1990's would state; *"The Internet isn't for us." "We won't be going down that route." "Our customers know who we are." "Our customers don't use computers." "We'll wait and see what our competition does first." "We're British so we don't need a website."* Among those that I actually spoke with during this period and about this issue were HMV, Woolworth's, Comet, Jessop's and Blockbuster Video. These and others thought that they were above having to make a continued effort to remain accessible to what could have been expanding markets and now they have paid the price and, I also believed at the time that these companies would blame a future recession if they failed to diversify and establish an on-line presence.

British retailers who declined the opportunity to get ahead in the 1990's and who refused to diversify their marketing strategies are now paying the price for such complacency and it is no coincidence. Incidentally, the reasons for why the John Lewis Group always thrives during recessions are never due to luck.

The English work 'ethic' and corporate capitalist maximisation has ensured that the UK has the longest and hardest working hours in Europe, whilst being one of the least productive countries in Europe and, many people who could work from home are still commanded to travel to an office every day and often, for reasons associated with nothing more than autocratic and/or tyrannical management styles.

It is 'Great' British imperial thinking that leads the UK population and its freely-elected 'leaders' into deceiving themselves regarding their illegal ownership of stolen lands [such as the Malvinas Islands] and of foreign artefacts and, it is the same thinking that is killing our international reputation, our economy and our natural environment.

The reason for why the UK government continually refuses the Argentine requests to enter into dialogue regarding the Malvinas Islands is because UK politicians lack the intelligence needed to justify or even reason UK 'ownership' of these islands. UK politicians would rather send our troops to war than get around a table with those who we owe accountability too and in my opinion, this is an act of extreme cowardice, arrogance and stupidity that costs the UK much integrity but, it's what the people have voted for.

The UK electorate has always got what it has voted for and so if child welfare is of no concern to the 'Great' British people, then child abuse across the UK will continue to proliferate.

Whilst human cultures simply label behaviours that they don't care to understand as acts of 'evil', we will continue to deny responsibility and continue to fail to protect our children and they will continue to suffer and, as a direct result of 'Great' British social and political cowardice.

The common attributes in every 'evil' act are that the instigator will be in pain, misunderstood and often isolated. This leads to the experience of being rejected by society [and of subsequently being rejected and disconnected from God] and this

leads to twisted thinking which at some point then leads to twisted behaviours. At the root of all 'evil' behaviour there is only fear and/or guilt.

For example; when young people carry a knife, it is because they either fear not being regarded by their peers [and so therefore have an out of control ego], and/or fear being harmed by others - they are not 'evil'.

Our children are rarely brought up by parents as they are often still children themselves and as a parent living close to or in poverty, they are also likely to be addicted to alcohol which although legal, is also the most dangerous and damaging drug in the world.

This legalised mass killer costs millions from taxpayer-funded NHS budgets while making millions for producers and is easily-accessible in poor communities [as guns are in the US] at the strongest potency and the cheapest prices.

UK parenting is more-often left to school teachers who can't bring-up children either because they're too busy conditioning them with crap in place of valuable truths - specifically regarding the history of Nikola Tesla [who successfully invented devices that could create free, clean and endless energy supplies], the history of Henry Ford [who invented a range of cars that were part-made from hemp and that ran on hemp seed oil], the history of hemp [and its ability to end deforestation while enhancing our economies], the definition of the word democracy [which actually means 'rule of the people', not 'freedom of speech'] and, regarding the nature of a creative God who existed before everything and who therefore has no needs.

UK children receive a mostly academic education with exams that really only test memory-recall ability and that deludes some into thinking that they are more intelligent than others [who then feel and behave inferior] when we are all equally capable of learning anything. Basically, Having a poor memory-recall ability is a separate issue to that of having poor intelligence.

With 'teachers' still mostly using fear over friendship and with children developing their own inferior complexes which often lead to guilt and isolation, our children are subjected to fear and restrictions on a daily basis - and we expect for them to learn and to develop positively in such an environment?

In my experience, the banding system that splits children onto one of usually three categories according to 'intelligence' is actually holding back the education of our children. During secondary education, I was in level B [mid range] for all three sciences and was averaging scores of B's and C's for coursework in Chemistry, Physics and Biology. Although keenly interested in Physics and Biology, I was mostly bored during lessons and so I messed around, entertained and day dreamed my way through until my behaviour became too distracting. I was eventually summoned to the Year Head and warned that if I didn't start behaving appropriately, I would be moved into the level A group where the teachers were firmer and were more feared. Basically, the Head used fear to try and control and discipline me and repeated the threat when I was soon-after called in again, warning me that I would be moved up into Mr Blah Blah's Chemistry group and Mrs Blah Blah's Biology group for a "*proper sorting out!*"

To make a point that I strongly believed in at that time, I continued to misbehave and eventually the Year Head carried out the threat and I was transferred into level A for all three sciences. I was made aware during my first lessons with my new science teachers that they had been warned [pre-conditioned] about me and that they were expecting trouble and so I used the opportunity to make my point.

I was respectful and I worked with focus and interest and never once scored lower than an A1 for all of my Biology coursework, while my grades also rose in Physics and

Chemistry. My new teachers were pleasantly surprised and encouraging and the pace was faster and so naturally, I was more interested in doing the work. I continued the pattern for the rest of that year but unfortunately, not one teacher or the Year Head ever said or acknowledged anything to me [or to anyone else] about what had happened and so, what we all learned and experienced from this was wasted by the so-called 'teachers' themselves.

I always believed since the first threat that I would perform better than I currently was if they did actually move me up a level and I told some of my friends of why I believed this too. I had become very political about 'the system' from an early age and had been complaining to my friends of how we were being held back, oppressed, restricted and controlled and not educated.

Our current system of 'education' encourages competition over collaboration, segregation over unity and discrimination over acceptance and so our children are ruled by fear and punishment instead of encouraged with friendship and compassion - which ultimately teaches them that bullying works and is acceptable.

Due to these characteristics, ALL UK governments have come to learn and accept that faith schools are the single biggest contributing factor declining social cohesion but for reasons relating to their own career-oriented fears, they will never admit to this to you but, they will though encourage the creation of more faith schools - all funded by the tax payer!

By supporting the current mis-education system and through the implementation of abuse-proliferating child welfare policies, we are literally funding the betrayal of our own children and therefore our future with our vote.

From my own limited experience of part-time assistance teaching, I have put into practice what I believed and during this time I very quickly became the 'expert' in handling the 'difficult' children. I would ask the other teachers not to tell me of who the 'trouble makers' were and I never actually could tell because all of the children always behaved well with me and with each other. It was only after that other 'teachers' would tell me of who these children were and, they were constantly amazed at the improved behaviour of the most aggressive and sometimes violent children. The effects were immediate and I developed a reputation where I would be given the 'awkward' or violent children but all I did was just be their friend. I taught with fun, compassion and assertiveness and in my belief, there were no nasty children in my world and so there were none in my groups.

Corporate marketing departments and interactive environments that encourage the use of violence [PC games], persecution, and fear are bringing-up our children. Children are being given a distorted education of how to interact in the world and they are making the story lines of their PC games a shared reality for all of us.

Most children are at their highest capacity for learning before the age of eight but it is years after this that children in the UK start to learn a second language and this has detrimental effects socially, economically and individually. Why are we not voting to have our children educated properly? Why are we not insisting that our children are educated about memory systems, stress management and assertiveness during the early years and before we start to clog their heads with pure academia, misinformation and political and religious conditioning?

Also during secondary education, I was studying Technical Drawing and never scoring less than an A1 for every piece of work and I loved it [My mother had taught me how to draw with 3D angular perspectives when I was five and so I had a bit of a head start]. At the same time, I was studying Music and Dramatics and was doing well in these subjects too but because of bureaucracy [not class sizes], I could only choose to

continue studying two of the three subjects for the final three years. I dropped Technical Drawing and had to fight my way through Music because out of the four of us who studied it, I was the only one who had no private tuition. I was also the only one who wasn't classically trained and I didn't have my own instrument until the final year. I worked weekends to pay towards my first keyboard and yes - my interpretation of Vivaldi's Four Seasons was a bit more 'on acid' than the three piano concertos served up by my competition!

It was only after the final exams that I was then told that my final mark for music would be downgraded by a whole grade simply and only because I was using an electronic instrument [I was stitched-up by my school regarding my favourite and most important subject]. The school argued that I had an unfair advantage over the other pupils because of my instrument being able to perform multiple tracks/parts simultaneously. I argued that I was at a disadvantage because I had to program and play it all into the memory in the first place and, then had to play along with it live and, that I also didn't have the knowledge and experience of musical theory and composition that the others had.

What a 'coincidence' that my final [adjusted] mark gave me a grade D and not a grade C, which would have enabled me to continue studying music at a higher level within further education. After the summer, I explained to my college of what had happened at secondary school and that I wanted to study music and they agreed to hold an appeal and about half a minute into my first demo, the cassette was stopped and I was given the most surprising compliments and told that I could have access to the full range of music courses at every level. I chose Psycho Acoustic Music Production because it seemed like the rebel of all music courses and I was feeling rebellious.

All I wanted to do was to learn about music theory, yet I had to endure a jealous, manipulative bully who had personal hang-ups regarding electronic music so, how exactly was this teaching? Also while at this school, my passion for history was destroyed within the first three days and again due only to a highly disrespectful bully who was a World War Two veteran who just couldn't leave it at the battle field.

Before secondary education and during my final junior year [aged nine] at a Catholic convent school, I experienced religious oppression consciously for the first time. It started when I lost it one day [too much of anything can go to your head - especially religion]. I built an altar in my bedroom and wrote my own prayer book and devised my own rituals so that I could worship God at home as well as at school. Thankfully, my mother discovered what was going on and de-radicalised me explaining that God would want for me to have a childhood [and not a priesthood] and that God knew I loved God regardless of how I may express this through worship.

What she said to me had much logic and throughout the night I started to real-ise that there were so many aspects within the practice of the religious that went against even their own logic. The next day I went to school and during the morning assembly, I refused to draw the Catholic cross across my chest during prayer. I real-ised during the night that although I believed in God, I wasn't a Catholic or a even liberal Christian [like my mother] and I didn't want to pray on-demand and so I decided to use my free will to choose not to - I wasn't affecting anyone else and so I saw it as my right to make this choice. I didn't understand what this ritual of drawing a cross over my chest meant [it was never explained] and I didn't understand why I was doing it [none of us did] and so I stopped. I went to school the next day with my refreshed beliefs about God and, feeling very strong about standing up for God [I did imagine God being supportive of my actions and I felt that my God was with me on this and so I followed my faith]. As we went into prayer at the end of the assembly, everyone put their hands together in front of themselves, closed their eyes and

repeated the indoctrination of the Headmaster and then ended with Amen [as usual] which again, none of us knew the meaning of or even questioned.

Why do you think it is that the religious start the indoctrination process of their children so early? What are the so-called 'leaders' and 'teachers' fearing so that they feel that they need to influence and control our perceptions and choices before we even do? Why do they fear us having our own relationship with God? Whose ego would this bruise? Yours? Gods?

Not at all.

A friend who was sat next to me tapped me and asked what I was doing and I told him "*Nothing.*" He told me that I had to pray and I told him that I didn't and as he went into prayer, I just looked around and I saw that the whole hall was full of minds too scared to think and to question - even though doing this would have harmed only the ambitions of someone seeking to control them. I remained discrete, but not discrete enough. I noticed that the Headmaster [who was new to the school and had just replaced the best teacher I ever had in my life] spotted me looking around and he was just staring at me whilst booming his requests, favours and demands to God. He couldn't believe his eyes and I couldn't either - he was so shocked and by the look of it, wanting to shout at me there and then but holding back at the last second before realising that he just couldn't get away with it. It looked like a first for him and I never saw any of this coming and only then did I know that he had taken my actions as a personal affront, and that I was fucked.

From that day onwards, we were in a never-ending cycle of him openly persecuting me in front of my friends and often, even while taking credit for my own efforts. For example; during football, he would play with us and would swap teams half-way through and when he was on my team and if no one else was in position, he would reluctantly pass the ball to me and I would score but every time this happened, it would be so far-out from the goal and so fast that most of the other children didn't actually see that I had scored the goal and would automatically assume it was down to him. When those who did see would point-out the truth to the others, they would then turn to him and ask if it was true and even though he never lied, he just remained silent and never once told the truth - leaving me and my friends to look like liars.

On another occasion during our school sport's day, me and my best friend had worked ourselves into such a euphoric state while cheering our team, that it got too much for us and we chose to leave our seats so that we could run and scream elsewhere alongside the track. Neither of us had experienced euphoria before and it was so amazing and so powerful and we just couldn't calm down but after about five minutes, the Head came over to us and told us to go and sit back down and as we did, he told the other children who were sat in the stands that we had been selfish and hadn't joined-in with supporting our team.

We were so shocked and so confused and as we sat back down, we lost all of our energy and were not able to continue to be supportive at all and so instead, we just became completely introverted - enabling him to tear into us further.

Looking back, I see now how this experience was like having an e pill proceeded by a massive, nasty come-down but, without the knowledge and awareness of what was actually happening to us at a biochemical and emotional level and, this is for why we were more vulnerable. Even when my friend's father died a few weeks later, he didn't stop. This was such a difficult time and my friend was so sad and although he then left my friend alone, he continued to persecute me.

This man and his behaviour was my introduction to the art of propaganda and I got

absolutely mashed. Our silent war went on and on eventually culminating in his ultimate attack on me which lasted for around an hour and was done in front of the entire school during an extended morning assembly.

This occurred because one afternoon, I had gone to collect my jacket from the cloak room and as I walked in, his son [who also attended the school and who was two years below me] was bullying two of my classmates. Since the day they both arrived at the school at the beginning of my final year, his son had continually bullied and harassed many of the other children across all years and no one stood-up to him. He would bully children younger and older than him and he would taunt us daily about how we couldn't do anything about it by constantly reaffirming that he was the Headmaster's son. After a while and in an effort to reduce the hardship, some of my friends tried to befriend him and even through I also tried this, after just three days I couldn't stick with it any longer.

On this particular afternoon, I had walked into the cloak room and there he was, bullying the only two girls in the whole school who were so shy and introverted that they were both exempt from having to answer their names when the morning register was called-out. During class, they would interact only with the teachers, me, and one of my friends – eventually letting us sit at their table with them.

He had one of their jackets and was refusing to give it back and every time they tried to take it, he would whip them with it and so after watching this for a while, I just lost it and went over to him. I grabbed the jacket from him and gave it to the girls and then I grabbed him by the scruff of his neck, lifted him up and stood him on the bench, pinning him against the meshed hanger wall. He was so shocked and started to cry while exclaiming the usual *"You can't do this – my dad's the Headmaster!"* and at that point and while holding him, I looked right into him and shouted that; *"I don't care if your dad is the emperor of the whole fucking planet! It all stops right now!"* After which, I let him down and he ran-off crying up the stairs and to his dad's office and I then walked past the girls and left the building to go home.

During the years since, I have considered that for personal reasons related to my own past and experiences, that it was possible that I may have inaccurately projected on to him that he was being nasty when he could have been just teasing them but, even if I was mistaken in my judgement in this instance, my actions never warranted what was to happen to me after.

The next morning and while we were all filing past the Head and into the building, he just calmly said to me; *"You picked the wrong one Alex."* I didn't react and went to my class and after registration, the rest of the class went down to the morning assembly while I remained behind with the teacher to take the test for the Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme, which I had previously missed.

About five minutes in, we were interrupted when a pupil returned to the classroom and told my teacher that the Head wanted to see me in the assembly. We were both confused and the teacher protested but, I still had to abandon the test and go [subsequently losing the opportunity to join the scheme]. As I walked into the assembly hall, the Head beckoned the other pupil to return to his place with the other children and indicated to me to stand a few meters away from him. For the next five minutes, he continued his sermon and then as he finished, he turned and looked at me, and then it started.

Despite what had happened between his son and myself the previous afternoon, I didn't strike or hurt his son and so wasn't expecting anything like what happened – by any measure. He started by booming to the assembly how *"We have a bully among us!"* and then for the next hour, he tore into me and lied to the other children, telling them how I had *"strangled"* his son and, for no reason. He told them about how I

would be a woman beater and a child beater when I was older and that God didn't want me and that the Devil had created me – not God.

I wasn't allowed to speak and would have been too scared too even if I was and up until that day, my only experience of being in front of a large group of people was when I was acting the role of St. Nicholas in a play at nursery school when I was about six.

He shouted, I cried, and he continued with no let-up. Lie after lie interspersed with religious doctrine which included God's feelings and opinions of me and of how I was placed upon the Earth to cause evil. He barked about how and why God didn't want me and that the only place for me was in Hell with the Devil who had created me.

It was about half an hour in when I had my first conscious experience of what I have since come to believe is my guardian angel. I had been crying and was feeling sick, dizzy and exhausted and was thinking about how I couldn't take it or stand-up much more and then in that moment, I started to feel the warmest feeling I had ever known. It was very physical - my body became warm all over and thoughts that were not my own but that were using my voice said to me; *"You're going to be okay. There's nothing more he can do to you. If you can stand it to this point then he can't hurt you. Be with me and you will be okay."*

I have no idea or memory of anything that the Head had said after this point because I was talking with this voice and thinking about this bubble that it had placed around me and of the warmth, energy and protection that I was feeling. Soon after, he stopped, dismissed me first and then the other children and so I was alone when back in the classroom – where I remained for the rest of the day.

In just one hour, he had successfully alienated the entire school from me with the exception of just one of my friends [Paul – I love him to this day]. He came home with me after school that day and as we sat playing with Lego in my bedroom, my mother came in. She could tell that I was different and she kept asking what had happened but on the way home and in fear of further punishment, I had ordered Paul not to say anything to my mother about what had happened that day. She continued asking, saying that she could tell something had happened but we remained silent until she asked Paul to step out of the room, where I then over-heard her asking him again while reassuring him and eventually, he told her.

She returned to my bedroom asking for confirmation regarding what Paul had just told her and so I explained about the assembly and about what had happened with the Headmaster's son the previous day. Right there and then, she just said; *"You're not going back to that school tomorrow."* I was so scared but she explained to me how even if I had done what the Headmaster had said I had done, that what he had done was far worse and that it needed looking into and that because of how he himself had behaved, I would be in danger if I returned.

It turned-out that he had also approached my little sister [who also attended the school] later that same day. She was only about seven and a half years old and in the playground, he continued his rant but at her, reiterating that God shouldn't have made me [even though during the assembly it was the Devil who had made me], further scaring and confusing the shit out of her.

What kind of a bastard does that? A Catholic one who is allowed to 'teach' children! He loved to throw his weight around – all of it! He was massive - a former rugby player but by the time he started at my school, most of him was just fat.

For the next few months, I remained out of school while the Headmaster remained under investigation by the Board of Education [which he initially refused to co-operate with - even locking them out of his office when they came to visit him at the school].

I'd had interviews with a child psychologist to assess for anger and intelligence and although judged at the time to have been of above average intelligence, I was told that I had to learn to control my anger. I was confused because it no longer seemed to matter why I did what I did or even that I didn't actually hit the Headmaster's son and also, because at no point was I actually taught how to control my anger by anyone. My parents divorced shortly after my first birthday and for whatever reason, my father wasn't around and my mother refused to entertain relationships until both myself and my younger sister were older and so without any mature masculine input in this regards, I had to create my own set of rules and safeguards for how to manage my anger.

I was repeatedly warned by the psychologist, other professionals and my mother that there was a danger that I could actually kill someone by not controlling my reactions and could be placed into care. I believed that they were serious and so I decided that from then onwards, I would only physically assault someone if I felt that I needed to [and therefore only in defence], and not just because someone had assaulted me [for example]. Up until this point and not unlike any of my friends, I had always hit back without actually first assessing if I actually needed to hit back. When I thought about this, I realised that one of my strengths was that I could take quite a beating before I actually felt pain or became damaged and so I decided to use this to my advantage. In-turn, I then discovered that as well as being able to keep cool before reacting, absorbing multiple hits from my assailants before striking back also confused, unnerved and drained them.

I'd witnessed and experienced violence from a very early age and among other things, it included witnessing the violent attempted abduction of a family member when I was five years old, and culminated in mass-bullying during my first year of primary school [aged seven]. I used to look very effeminate and would often be mistaken for a girl by strangers and shopkeepers and this was the only basis for all of the bullying that I endured at this school. It was so overt and so regular and was committed by so many of the children that the school eventually had to concede that they couldn't control it and it was suggested that I found a new school for the remaining three years of primary education.

I started the second year at the Catholic convent which at the time had an amazing Headmaster and he was also my class teacher. The other children treated me so differently to what I was used to at the other school and I made many friends quickly and was literally loving it. For the next two years, the Headmaster [Bill Plumber] was my class teacher and he was brilliant and was without question the most amazing teacher I was ever taught by at any stage of my education.

On a day when I was feeling a bit bored, I started throwing screwed-up balls of paper across the class room while he was talking and I thought I was getting away with it but at the end of the afternoon and when we were all about to go home, he asked us to remain seated until the person who threw bits of paper owned up to doing it.

I was too embarrassed to admit that it was me and so I just sat there wondering what to do but after a few minutes of watching my classmates starting to get restless, I raised my hand into the air. He then told everyone that they could go but asked me to stay behind and after they had left, he told me that he knew it was me and that he just wanted me to be honest about it and then he just asked me why I did it. He didn't discipline me and instead, he just questioned me. For ages, I just repeated that I didn't know why I had done it, which was a lie. The truth was that I was too embarrassed to let him know that I was bored and didn't want to upset him. We'd been talking for about ten minutes when my mother arrived and asked him why I was still there and if everything was okay. He lied. He pretended that everything was okay and that we were just having a general chat about how I was finding things at school.

He didn't tell her that I had been naughty or that he was 'disciplining' me and just apologised for keeping me late.

As time went on we got to know each other better and he started treating me slightly different to the other pupils but, he was very subtle. He would question my answers to his questions more than he would the others and he showed me much trust too. For example; there were many times when he would forget something from his car and so would give me his car keys and ask me to fetch what ever it was – usually his lunch or tobacco.

It was in the third year [aged eight] when our conversations started getting political. I didn't myself realise this and instead thought that I was just asking questions about people and systems. Occasionally during class, he would suddenly pretend that I had done something wrong and send me to wait outside and after a few minutes, he would come out and get me to help him with pinning-up artwork and notices in the hallway and throughout this time, he would talk with me about political issues and aspects and it soon became very literal.

I remember the first conscious conversation that we had on this level and it began with him asking me if I knew what propaganda was. I remember my answer of; *"Is propaganda when one country lies to another country?"* and I remember his; *"Almost."* followed by his definition and examples of why and how people use propaganda. To this day, my definition has basically remained the same; Propaganda is the art of selling opinions by manipulating the presentation of information. This is done consciously or sub-consciously with honesty or with deceit and if with deceit, it can be done by omission or by lying because omission is still deceit. Propaganda is simply opinionated information.

Fox News [part of Rupert Murdoch's Newscorp group] is known the world-over in media circles as The Lie Factory and it has earned this nickname by repeatedly blatantly lying in its news reports. For example; the so-called 'Moscow riots' of 2012 that were actually filmed in Greece is confirmed as a fake by the Greek police uniforms and the slight give away of the footage being filmed right outside the Greek National Bank in Athens.

On the other hand but, only up until 2013 [when a Western-backed armed minority revolution and subsequent unelected coup 'government' over-threw the elected and UN-accepted government of Ukraine], the BBC never lied but always instead deceived by omitting information. For example; In David Cameron's rush to declare war against Syria's President Assad in 2013 and, while known to the rest of the world outside of the EU and US, the BBC failed to report on the use of an Islamic fatwa issued by a Saudi Arabian Cleric that 'allowed' the Cameron-funded Syrian FSA [Free Syria Army] to rape women and children who live in pro-Assad areas – even if these families didn't vote for Assad. Another fatwa to 'allow' the murder of women and children was also issued a few weeks later and again, those traitors at the British Brainwashing Corporation have remained silent about it to this day.

While telling us in words that Russia had invaded Ukraine, the BBC and all Western lamestream media failed to transmit a single image of a single Russian troop in Ukraine but on words alone, the UK sheeple chose to believe it and why? Simply because it's the BBC and, it is not a coincidence that most who worship the BBC also do not actually know the true definition of the word democracy.

In reality and unlike Western invasions of foreign lands, Russia was invited into semi-autonomous Crimea in East Ukraine [it has it's own UN-accepted parliament and has an agreement with Russia to house a naval base] by the existing Crimean Prime Minister so as to defend the Crimean population from militant attacks led by the illegal Western-backed unelected armed minority coup 'government' in the capital Kiev, that

over-threw the elected Ukraine government – an international crime.

Through NATO, the West has for years been extending its containment policy towards Russia by influencing or consuming governments of countries that surround Russia and by then installing weapons systems that target Russia. Hypothetically, this is no different to Russia invading or influencing Ireland or Scotland [for example] so as to aim aggression towards the UK.

In short; the West is a victim of basic psychology, letting greed and paranoia [fear] create 'enemies' in its head and, these inaccurate and religiously deluded projections of Western governments are then sold to the unquestioning masses by corporate 'news' networks.

In further conversations over the months, we talked much about political and religious issues and everything was great right up until the end of the year when he announced that he was quitting and that a new Headmaster would be taking his place and, he also explained that after the summer break, I'd have a new class teacher for the final year. I was gutted.

I started the fourth and final year after the summer and things started to go wrong with the new Headmaster very soon and, all on the back of me refusing to pray or to draw the Catholic cross across my chest and despite both him and my former Headmaster both being Catholics, I have never believed that my former Headmaster would ever have taken offence to my anti-religious actions in that moment.

During the months that I was off school after what had happened at the convent, I began to feel closer to my God and I started to ask so many questions about everything that related to this experience and I spent much time thinking particularly about the links between Catholicism, its 'teachers' and its 'God'. I didn't hold the beliefs that I do now and so at the time, the Head was my 'evil enemy' and according to him and in his own words "*The Devil made Alex, not God!*" so I was a little Devil!

Sometimes, I wish that I could re-experience this chapter of my life but, with what I now believe. I would have so much fun playing the Devil role in a Catholic convent and would have completely taken the piss!

My mother tried to get me into a new school so I could complete the remainder of the final year and being that there was only one left in the town that was prepared to accept me and, being that my mother had told me that she couldn't afford the cost of the bus fair to travel to a school outside of town, I had to make it work.

Throughout all of the months that I was out of school, other children from other schools would approach me asking if I was Alex Anthony [my name at the time]. I would say "Yes." and they would proceed to attack me for being expelled for [according to them] beating-up the Headmaster's son. Every time I tried to explain the truth I was ignored and so after a while, I stopped trying to correct them and instead just took their shit.

This continued on almost a daily basis until I was thirteen when my mother re-married and it only stopped because I adopted my stepfather's name. For reasons oriented in always wanting a father, I would have changed my name anyway but by this time, it was mostly a political decision.

From then on, when children approached and asked if I was Alex Anthony, I would say "No." and I believed it because it was the truth. My conviction would confuse them and their attacks would disintegrate and they would leave me alone and walk away confused. After four years, I had finally brought an end to the effects of the Headmaster's propaganda campaign against me.

Before this point though and in my first meeting with the Head of the new junior

school, he told me himself that he had spoken with my former Headmaster on the telephone and he actually told me that he didn't like him and he also told me that he thought he was lying about me. He told me that he was going to give me the benefit of the doubt but, on one condition. That condition was that I never ended-up in his office for anything troublesome – even if I was innocent.

In my naivety, the first time that another child picked a fight with me, I simply explained why we couldn't fight and it didn't take long for news to get around that if the new kid ends up in the Headmaster's office for anything, he will be expelled. For those months, I had many children approaching me on a daily basis to push me into a fight in the hope that I would get expelled. I had to learn to fight without fighting and spent entire lunch breaks holding these fuckers to the ground so that I didn't have to hurt them. On top of this, the school bullies would sometimes also force children on to me who I knew didn't want to fight me and so I was I just held them down but, all of this was very enduring because it was so regular and because I was still dealing with the trauma of my previous experience at the convent. The relief and defence offered when a friend stepped in after asking why I didn't fight back was welcome but, it wasn't enough and it wasn't until we all moved-up to the local secondary school that I could start to re-balance things.

During the final year of junior school, the only time I decided to fight back was when the school big boy wanted to fight me. His friends had told us both that they would be friends with who ever won [they felt they were on to a sure bet with him] and as I had no friends and needed the other children off my case, I decided to risk fighting him. As it happened, he damaged his hands thumping my head and wanted to quit before I even hit him so I let him go and his mates became mine and of course I was not concerned for their 'friendship' - it was political. Funny thing was that during secondary school, he actually became one of my friends!

My journey to and from the primary school and then after, to and from my secondary school took me past the convent and so even after leaving behind what had happened, it was still in my life on a daily basis and I was aware that this was having an ever-increasing negative effect on me. I started to feel that the only way to stop this was to actually go back and to face the Headmaster and, it just happened that throughout all of this time, my mother had been receiving intermittent reminders and financial demands relating to a book that I had borrowed from the convent library [which I had actually returned years before] and so I used this as my prompt.

By this time I was also a bit older [ten years old] and so one afternoon on the way home, I just walked in off the street and went straight to his office. I knocked on the door, waited for him to say to enter and as I did and as he saw me, his faced turned to shock. He sat down at his desk and his son who was there with him covered behind him and they said nothing. I told him about the reminders and that the book was returned years ago and that I knew this because I was actually the school librarian before he turned-up and, I then told him to stop sending the reminders to my mother or I would come back. He agreed to stop sending them and told me that my mother would hear no more about it – which she didn't.

Even to this day, I find it difficult to express in words the feeling of power and strength that consumed me in that moment and for a long time after because, I was literally experiencing how money was not power and, that power is merely the ability to influence people – through whatever means.

On the Christian side of life and outside of school, attending fellowship meetings had been both confusing and fun and I enjoyed meeting with the other children and being invited to their homes for dinner along with my mother and little sister. They were so lovely and generous – once handing a cheque to my mother for £700 [which is a lot

now but was worth even more in the early nineteen eighties] just to help her to get-by. It was a mostly-selfless gesture and wasn't done for recruitment reasons – my mother had long-before decided to attend their meetings and to befriend them and they knew this.

It was when I was around twelve years old and while attending a church meeting with my mother [usually held at the weekends and evenings at a member's home or in a local school hall] that I noticed the PA system that was being used for the bands who performed on the stage. It consisted of an H&H six channel mixer with a built-in coil reverb unit and power amplifier and two fuck-off big H&H speakers that had to be transported by their own trailer.

The first time that I approached it I could see all the cables leading from the instruments and into the mixer and then out to the speakers and I just sat there with the sound engineer watching everything he was doing. As soon as the meeting finished, I told my mother that I wanted to do the sound engineering for the meetings and after a few weeks of learning and of assisting, the mixer arrived at my home [minus the speakers] so that I could have a play with it and use it in between meetings. By this time, my mother [who played piano and guitar] was in a relationship with the bass player from the church band and he would let me use his Fender Precision bass.

By around thirteen years old, I had a bedroom studio that consisted of a bass guitar running through various pedal effects units and then into the mixer [it didn't have effects send and return circuits] which was then slaving my hi-fi where I could record onto its built-in cassette deck while monitoring everything through the hi-fi speakers [a very tasty pair of B&O speakers]. The soon-after addition of a Tascam four track real-to-real recorder enabled me to multi-track bass recordings and for the next couple of years I just explored, experimented and learned.

The hi-fi's built-in cassette deck had an instant and silent pause button and I developed a technique where I could create extended versions of my records by slamming the pause button down in beat. They became known by my friends as 'Alex's pause-button remixes' and until I left home, they were regularly asking me to create ten minute versions of their favourite records!

At fifteen years old, I was told [not asked] by the Head of Drama that I was going to do the sound for the school show later that year. He just came over to me at the end of a drama lesson and said; "*You're doing the sound for the school show. You're too quiet but it's not who you are.*" I was really surprised and didn't know how to respond but I was smiling and just said "*oh, okay.*"

The play came and went with no problems and I was soon after asked if I wanted to do the sound for next year's show and I accepted the offer straight away – soon after making a bit of history for being the first pupil in the school to do the sound for two out of five annual shows and also, for the Board of Education's judgement of it being the best soundtrack for a school show that year.

I was then asked if I would like to do the sound for the third year running, by which time I would no-longer even be at the school and although I was up for it, my girlfriend at the time who was in the year below me told me that one of her classmates really wanted to have a shot at it and she suggested that it was maybe a bit unfair if I didn't let him and, being that I had already done it for two years running and that I wouldn't even be a pupil at the school by the time of the show, I agreed with her.

In the back-ground and from the age of twelve, I had been questioning the church and Christianity – even writing a letter to them asking what it was all about and where

it was all going. I was becoming very confused and angry and I asked them how following Jesus was compatible with following a government and if there was going to be some kind of up-rising at some point. It was around this time that I started to develop opposing opinions of the church and wanted to pull-away and being that no one in the church could answer my questions, I started to withdraw from it completely.

In the final meeting I attended at around fourteen, some people felt the 'love of God' to the point where they collapsed in tears in a heap on the floor wailing like hounds. They were lovely people and so generous but this was crazy scary shit and, I felt that much of it was insincere and I was telling my mother that most of these people didn't believe in what they were doing and that it made me very uncomfortable.

Also during this time, I grabbed the Good News Bible from my mother's book shelf and started to read it and I was amazed - I just couldn't put it down. War, sex, violence, bestiality, philosophy from eight hundred year old 'prophets' and much politics, I was hooked and I came to understand why people say that if the Bible was ever to be turned into a movie, it would be banned across the world.

I had never known of the nature of its content before and up until then, I had assumed that it was purely a 'Godly' instruction manual but I was blown away and started to take it to my reading class at school so that I could finish it. My non-religious friends thought I was being all 'Christian' and although I explained what was in it and why I was reading it, they didn't get it and despite concluding that it was just another device for control [as with the other religious books], I'm so glad that I read it [as with the books of other religions].

Earlier in my childhood [when I was busy hating God], my mother had questioned if I had been possessed by something but, she didn't tell me of this until years later and after the church fell apart. Towards the end, she was fine with me making my own choices about attending meetings and a few years later, members actually admitted that they were faking their expression because they were too scared to just be themselves because they thought that others would judge them for not being in-touch or connected to God. This particular church even warranted a Panorama Investigation on national TV which focused on cults and brainwashing but, no one was 'evil', corrupt or brainwashed. They were loving people who refused to question and so were just scared or guilty, that's all.

Think of something right now, something that you yourself did at some time and consider to have been a bad, negative or 'evil' act [no need to get heavy]. Scrutinise yourself for the reasons and motives for why you did it. What were your thoughts before you did what you did? What did you set out to achieve? How was it to have benefited you?

If you were being greedy, what did you fear not having enough of? If you were being defensive, what part of you was fearing being under attack?

What were you fearing would happen if you didn't shout or hit-out? What were the benefits if you did? Do you even re-member choosing to behave in such a way or do you still blame the other person for how you chose to react - regardless of their provocation?

Generally, we all choose to react in the ways that we do and for most of us this happens as a conscious thought. When in intense situations, the thought process can happen so fast that we may not realise at the time that we have even made a choice [we snap] and we just shift the responsibility but, after you have reacted you may remember - if you want to. If you analyse your memory for the thought process that you undertook, you may come to remember the last thought that you chose to put

into action and you will see that the thought and motive to do the action come only from fear or guilt within you - not from the 'Devil' or from anything from another person or entity.

Whatever the reasons or motives, you will see in any example that you give to yourself that only fear or guilt lie at the roots of your own negative behaviour - not 'evil' or the 'Devil', just you. This does not mean that you are 'evil' but, it does mean that you do have power and responsibility over your own choices - it means that you have free will and therefore, that you are responsible.

What we call 'evil' is simply no more than behaviours influenced by our own fear and guilt. Maybe 'evil' is and always was just a metaphor for these traits? Whilst we blame the 'Devil' we don't see the truth within. Whilst we don't see the truth within we can't become less 'evil'. The 'Devil' is only within us in the form of a metaphor because our own fear and guilt and only these are the true enemies of man.

If we were to deal with our own fear and guilt, there would be less 'evil' in the world - thereby cancelling out the impact of any 'Devil' so, whichever way your truth lies, by addressing your own fear and guilt, you also deal with perceived 'evil'.

It would be no coincidence that if we faced our inner-fears and let go of guilt, we would find that we have no enemies and that there is no such thing as 'evil'.

Assuming that God has needs, is to ignore that God existed before anything else. Assuming that God needs us to do battle with anything or anyone that is 'evil', is to ignore that God is all-powerful and all-merciful and has no needs and has given us free will. It is a denial of the notion that God loves us all at all times regardless of what we do.

The Satanists are deluded and usually either with not enough ego to fuel their self-confidence or, with too much ego to put their confidence to any self-beneficial use - and to think that they put all that energy into something that can only ever exist in their heads or as a discarnate fragmented post-death entity [what the religions refer to as a 'ghost' or 'demon']? So much to the 'power' of the 'dark side'! these idiots can't even see that their apparent master comes from God [in one metaphoric form or another] and so works for God [one way or another]. If the 'Devil' did exist outside of our illusion, then the 'Devil' would be God's bitch.

It is my belief that the 'Devil' and 'evil' are no more than projections of our judgemental aspects and because we are judgemental, we see God as being judgemental and we therefore create a purpose to the existence of a 'Devil' and 'evil' [with much help from the religious 'leaders' and politicians of course] and of course, religion.

By humanising God, we perceive that God has needs and weaknesses a lot like our own and we therefore misunderstand the nature of God and therefore also our purpose. How weak and needy would God be if God needed us to kill the 'non-believers' and the 'sinners' on Gods behalf - especially when God has no needs and we have free will?

The human psyche knows that it is part of God and so it is partly in our nature to humanise our perception of God because we are God and God is us but, just like how we as humans are individual but not separate, so too is God and God the source has no needs and so we ALL have free will. It is no different to the relationship that exists between parents and children; Children are from parents and so are connected to their parents and so are alike but, they are not their parents - they are individual.

We even use God's name to justify our Christian Crusades and our Islamic Jihads. Maybe a true Crusade or Jihad is about recognising and fighting the 'Devil' within? Would a warrior of God or Allah and peace fight false enemies with a sword, or fight

the fear and guilt within both him and his 'enemies' with his heart, mind, courage and compassion? If knowledge enables us to make the most informed choices, isn't knowledge therefore the most powerful weapon, and not the sword?

One of the most obvious contradictions in the Qur'an is the notion that there is such a thing as a non-believer because according to the Qur'an, everyone is already Muslim just waiting to awaken and realise this. The Qur'an even states that this is why it is not possible for a non-Muslim to convert, but only to revert so, if the Qur'an states that the whole world is already Islamic and also states that it is not permissible for Muslims to kill Muslims, then only false Muslims will kill anyone based upon this contradictory belief.

However, within Christianity the existence of non-believers is possible because the Bible does not ever say that the whole world is already Christian.

Apparently, Jesus asked God to forgive the non-believers because "*they know not what they do.*" So, if a true Muslim believes in the teachings of the Qur'an and therefore of Jesus then regarding the non-believers, wouldn't the true Muslim also ask Allah to forgive the non-believers - because they know not what they do? Isn't this why the Qur'an describes Christians as "*the misguided ones*"?

All of this makes it even more unlikely that Allah needs, or would even desire that Muslims kill the non-believers [if they did exist] because the non-believers are [according to the Qur'an] Muslims who simply do not yet know that they are already Muslim and in principal, how is this any different to the notion of punishing a child simply for what that child didn't know?

The notion that Mohammed was a paedophile is pure Christian demonisation and propaganda because according to the relevant derivatives of the Qur'an, Mohammed saw and identified that six year old Aisha would be his wife one day and, even though Mohammed would have been around forty two years old at this time, Mohammed expressed no sexual desires or sentiments towards her until she was an adult.

Aisha was seventeen when they married and she remained in the family home for three years with the marriage not being consummated until she was around twenty years old.

Paedophilia is a behaviour that revolves specifically around the belief that it is acceptable for adults to engage in sexual interactions with children. No aspect of this belief was ever demonstrated by Mohammed and so, regardless of how inappropriate, unusual, unreasonable or unjustified a forty two year old man identifying a future wife in a six year old girl may be, Mohammed was by clinical definition, never a paedophile.

It is unfortunate for Islam that some paedophiles who follow Islam also use this same propaganda so as to 'justify' having sexual interactions with children.

Let the ones who use their free will to choose to kill each other in the name of a peaceful and of a loving God go and kill each other. It is their choice to do so and they have all agreed to it by using their free will. You can choose to take sides simply because you share the same fears as one party or because you share religion and are like sheep, or you can choose to be of peace and to not take part and to not further inflame the violent situations created by the deluded. When all of the self-righteous extremists from ALL religions have extinguished themselves [in the name of God], there will only be those of peace remaining because, you can instead choose to fight a real Crusade or Jihad against fear and guilt instead of against other souls.

Martyrs of military Islamic Jihad who are motivated by the prospect of receiving seventy two virgins upon entry into Heaven, are clearly motivated by sexual self-gratification over anything else [which is forbidden in the Qur'an - unless a wife is

refusing her husband's sexual demands of course]. Also, there is no mention of the gender of these virgins and, no mention of how a celestial virgin can even have sex in the first place [as he/she will have no physical body]?

Regarding fighting 'evil', would any Catholic please show me how it is that the physical bodies of your passed loved ones will rise from the grave to join with Jesus and the angels to fight Satan on Earth? I may be missing something here but what good is such a body after years of decay? Or do Catholic bodies not rot? If they do rot then what good will they be in physical combat? For myself, I would like to think that if I was to lead others into a military battle, that they would at least be able-bodied!

Wouldn't Jesus do the same if he were to wage a military war against anything? If it is not to be a military war then the issue of Catholic bodies rising from the grave defies all logic because these bodies would have no purpose - as with the idea that God, Jesus or us have to fight anything anyway.

I believe that Jesus was a true warrior and would rather die than kill another human. Didn't this actually happen? Don't the books all state that Jesus died on the cross for us [and apparently for our 'sins' so that God would not punish us?]. It's very convenient how we've passed the burden of our 'sins' onto one of the most beautiful men that ever graced this Earth. Why not make it all worth something and finally take responsibility for the results of our own choices and deal with the real enemies of our own internal fear and guilt? Whilst we believe in the existence of the 'Devil' and 'evil' we let our fears and guilt get the better of us and so it is only us who create 'evil' and so, do we choose to fight or to befriend our fears?

While the religions continue to spread the propaganda that influences people to perceive that they are separate from God, the world will continue to experience what they call 'evil'. God is concerned ONLY with the essence [well-being] of the soul and NOT for human behaviour and while the religions lie about our behaviour determining our entry into Heaven, people will continue to feel separate from God and separation and isolation lead to feelings of rejection and then to illness and then to twisted thinking and then to twisted behaviours ['evil'].

'Evil' is simply mismanaged human fear and guilt - nothing more.

If God created everything then God has no needs, if God has no needs then God is vulnerable to nothing, if God is vulnerable to nothing then God can't be threatened by anything, if God can't be threatened by anything then God has no use for laws, if God has no laws then we have free will and there is no punishment, if there is no punishment then there is no Hell and if there is no Hell, then there is no Devil - just us, God and Heaven and therefore, all 'evil' [in any form] stems from man only because the roots of 'evil' are only ever mismanaged human fear and guilt.

In my experience, nothing incites fear and guilt more than the religions do - it is their lifeblood!

How and why God doesn't desire that we fear God

[If God is vulnerable to nothing then God can't be threatened by anything]

If God loves every single one of us regardless of what we do because God has no needs and so has set no rules, then why fear God? Why not love God? Doesn't God want to be our friend? Don't you want to be friends with God? Why would a God who has no needs want for us to fear God? Why would a God who loves us want for us to fear God?

When was the last time you wanted your loved ones to fear you? If you love them, why would you want for this? Do you think this would be love that you would be giving to them or that they would be giving love to you - if they 'loved' you out of fear? How would you really feel if you realised that people only 'loved' you out of fear? How could someone love anyone out of fear? How would love come from fear? If you are scared of God then how do you be friends with God? If you are scared of God then how do you love God or, accept God's love?

If as a non-religious person, you choose to have your child Christened "*Just in case God does exist.*" are you really so stupid that you do not see that God would know of your insincerity? Do you think that God would not know that you 'love' God just to satisfy your own fears? Is this not simply cowardice coupled with a denial of God's intelligence and eternal connection with us?

How does a God who has no needs benefit from you fearing God? Is it just you who believes that you may benefit from fearing God? Is it not your fears that you try to satisfy here? If God did benefit from you fearing God, why would this be the sort of 'God' who you would want to worship?

Where does this leave you if you fear both the 'Devil' and God? Who is your friend then? Who do you love then and who loves you? If you fear both the 'Devil' and God, then why do you see them as the same? Is God then also a dictator-type control freak who inflicts pain and wants for us to hurt each other? Why would God want for us to fear God when fear becomes our enemy and creates pain for others and for ourselves?

The self-righteous religions will judge and condemn you for not fearing God even if you are in love with God. I remember seeing a TV documentary a few years ago where the Head of a Christian faith school said to the interviewer that the fear of God was necessary so as to control the 'bad' behaviour of humans. He then went on to say that if it wasn't for the fear of God, that he himself would be doing all sorts of things that he didn't currently do. He also stated that this was the same for all of us - that we all somehow need to fear something 'bad' happening to us to make us behave appropriately. It had never occurred to this 'educated man of God' and 'teacher' of children that many, if not most people are actually decent to others simply because they choose to be decent. They are decent because they choose to care for their fellow man and because they are not an ill psychopath and not fearful of God. Most balanced people do not seem to need to fear God to make themselves behave!

How fucking scary is that? A 'man of God' who expresses desires to explore the darker side of human nature - but doesn't only because God will chuck him in to 'Hell' - and he is in a position of responsibility over school children for fuck sake! What if this guy realised that God wouldn't punish him but would instead counsel and love him? Maybe for ill psychopaths it's better that they do fear God?

If God has no needs and therefore nothing can be against God, then it can only be that God-fearing man invent the concept of 'sin' and of it being righteous to fear God?

How and why sin does not exist

[If God can't be threatened by anything then God has no purpose for laws]

If [as the religions state] God created everything and existed before everything, then God has no needs. If God has no needs then God is vulnerable to nothing. If God is vulnerable to nothing then God can't be threatened by anything. If God can't be threatened by anything then God has no purpose [and therefore no use] for laws and so, if there are no laws for anything then there can be no punishment for anything. This only leaves that we have free will and that 'sin' does not exist.

Aren't all 'sins' supposed to be threats to God - a God who existed before everything and so who therefore has no vulnerabilities and so can't be threatened?

As God has no needs, nothing can be against God because nothing can affect God's being. If God's well-being depends upon the behaviour of humans, then God must have come into existence after humans so as to be dependent upon them but, the religions state that God created everything and so without realising, the religions themselves demonstrate how 'sin' can not exist because, nothing can threaten a God or be against a God who has no dependencies. As the truth about the nature of a creator God spreads, it is only the scared and twisted men of religion who will be affected as they lose control of the freedom of others and it is these men alone who invented the concept of 'sin' [along with concepts such as 'evil', the 'Devil' and 'Hell'] and of course, natural human healing abilities based upon working with natural human energies and angels are tools of the 'Devil' - despite Jesus being quoted in the Bible as saying; *"this and more will you do."* after performing a healing.

What the religions and many psychics and healers don't want for you to ever know is that ALL humans are capable of psychic, spiritual and energetic healing – regardless of how 'good' or 'bad' they are. It is not a special power or a 'gift' given to 'special' people by God or by angels and is instead a simple fundamental human ability. Healers who tell you that only certain people can heal are people who have not addressed their ego and their need to feel special and, they may not even be aware that they have such a 'need' and, they may truly believe that they have something over other people and as such, they will often refer to their healing abilities as 'special powers' or 'special abilities'. They are victims of an out of control ego that demands that they do anything that makes them look special and above others and, they just can't live without doing this.

Whether you heal by using psychic transmission, energetic manipulation, mind projection, angelic assistance, prayer, affection, humour, music, art – it's all the same and ALL are forms of healing and no one method is of more importance than any other.

Love aids and strengthens the immune system and a strengthened immune system is better-placed to fight diseases. A person with compassion but without knowledge of any specific healing forms can heal just as effectively as a healer who has knowledge and experience.

It is love itself that heals – regardless of how it is delivered. If you love someone who is ill and can deliver your love to them in any way that is tangible for them, their immune system will benefit from this and will have more potential for taking care of any illness and I believe that this is how it is possible that ALL humans can heal. If we all loved each other instead of feared each other, we would be freeing the world of much pain – both emotional and physical and re-member; it is emotional dis-ease that leads to physical dis-ease.

Viruses are not the same as diseases and are actual living entities in their own right and are not aware of doing anything 'wrong' when inhabiting & damaging a host but despite this, I still believe that a strong immune system has the potential to deal with viruses as well as diseases.

Humans are parasites [as all living entities are] but when you consider that unlike viruses, humans consciously damage their host [the planet], we are then the world's most dangerous parasitic virus. I absolutely guarantee that if viruses were aware of the damage they caused, they would adapt and evolve - something that humans stopped doing when accepting the 'word of God' from the religious who tell us that God doesn't want for us to have self-rule and true democracy [political freedom].

Healing those who suffer was never a 'sin' and can never be against a God who has no needs. To the contrary, didn't all of the prophets say that God wants us all just to love each other?

Are not all sins really just crimes against other men? How and why can a man who says that he believes that God loves us with free will, want for you to fear God? How could such men even know anything about the nature of God? How are there any rules to break [or 'sins' to commit] when we have free will?

If God has no needs or requirements of us then whose laws are we breaking when we commit a 'sin'? The laws of Moses? The laws of the prophets? The laws of scared and over-dressed bearded men?

When I ask this to people of religion, the explanation I get is something like this; *"God gave us free will to choose to live on either the path of righteousness or the path of sin and death. However, if we choose the path of sin, God will punish us."*

According to this explanation, God gave us a choice where one option sees us being rewarded and the other sees us being punished. Now, who in their 'right' mind would knowingly choose to be punished? More importantly, what sort of 'choice' is God giving us if God has influenced it so that we will likely choose the option that 'God' wants us to choose? Does this not then contradict the free will aspect? If God attaches a condition to our choice then doesn't this then make God the ultimate artist of manipulation? If God attaches a condition to our choice then what is 'God' fearing when God is invulnerable to nothing?

Generally, when I then ask this to people of the Jewish-oriented faiths [Judaism, Christianity, Catholicism], I get told that I do not have the right to question God or to be *"psychoanalysing God."* I get told that I am of the Devil sent to test them. I get told that I am not scientifically or philosophically qualified to be asking such questions [even though I think to ask them in the first place]. I get told to just *"open my heart and let Jesus in."* while entertaining their attempts at conversion. I get told that *"The Bible is the word of God!"* I get told that I'm *"just being difficult!"* and, I have been told to leave some meetings with such people simply for putting this issue to them.

The 'people of God' tell me that *"God has disconnected from you for committing the sin of questioning God!"* and when I question them about their judgements of me, they simply say that they know this to be true yet when I ask them to explain how they know this, they have no explanation other than *"It's in the Bible, the Bible says so."* etc. When I ask them if they realise how judgemental and condemning they are being when they can't explain their own dire judgements of me to me, they have nothing to say. Is this rejection really all part of the love and word of God? No! It is religious defensiveness and oppression and if books of contradiction, violence, revenge and judgement are the word of God, then this is a God who is worse than any Devil.

When I ask this question to people of Islam, I am mostly encouraged in my

questioning and respected for it and for my exploration of God. No Muslim has ever tried to convert me or has ever condemned me for my questioning. No Muslim has yet though answered my question about the nature of 'sin' but, they do encourage me to question further and they do offer to introduce me to others who would be happy to discuss the issue with me. However, those who do offer to answer my questions then change their minds upon hearing my question about how it is that Allah has needs and requirements of us when Allah existed before everything.

The interesting thing here is that while the books of both religions encourage questioning, some Imams say that it is okay to do so only up to a point, whilst some Muslims question everything and others question nothing. In my experience, very few Christians seem to question anything and when you consider that most anti-Islamic propaganda comes from Christians who've never even read the Qur'an [while the Qur'an respects Christians and Jesus as one with Islam], I feel that how I am treated by both is reflective of their respective attitudes. However, everyone still leans on his or her conflicting book as being the word of God.

In my opinion, the Bible's content is mostly [if not all] metaphoric. The 'star' that the three kings followed to arrive at the birthplace of Jesus was not a star in the sky because in that region, the Head shepherd was know as the Star so, the three kings followed a shepherd to the birthplace of Jesus. Isn't it logical to assume that it would have been highly probable that the Head shepherd who worked those lands would be likely to know of the birthplace of Jesus?

Roman history recalls that wine was simply fruit juice without alcohol and the Bible says nothing specifically about alcohol being in wine so, if Jesus actually turned water into fruit juice then is the Christian faith using this as a convenient excuse just to get pissed? How can they judge others who use or abuse drugs when they themselves use and abuse the drug alcohol? How also can any Muslim judge and condemn anyone who uses or abuses any drug? Is it not true that until the UK started secret domestic Opium cultivation in 2011, most of the world's heroin was grown and supplied to the world from Afghanistan – an Islamic state?

Some interpretations of Revelations in the Bible say that the dead birds that groan through the sky are probably aircraft and that the thunder that roles on tracks is probably representative of trains etc. I believe that the tree of knowledge and the apple that Eve ate were also metaphoric and, that not much in the Bible is literal. Its followers have not been shown this and, they seem to know little or nothing of Roman history but when you start to decode the metaphors in the Bible you start to see a different story and a different God and maybe, some fear us seeing the truth of the nature of God - that God has given us free will without conditions and so will not punish but will only love ALL of us regardless of what we do? I believe that they fear us knowing this because ultimately, they will lose control over their sheeple.

Even if you do actually believe that Eve ate a real apple from a real tree and that somehow this gave her knowledge that she wasn't supposed to have, then how would it have been a threat to God if Eve used her free will to choose to eat the apple? How does God have something to fear from us having knowledge of anything when God has no needs and therefore can't be threatened? Why would Adam and Eve be punished for exercising his free will? Did God lie to Adam about giving him free will or was it not free will? With a God this manipulative, why worry about a snake?

According to the religions, the first 'sin' was created when Eve ate from the tree of knowledge. She became aware that she was naked and she then felt shame [she became self-aware] so, if becoming self-aware [a natural process for all humans] is against God, then why is God so weak and in fear of evolution? Is God a control freak who doesn't wish for us to know the truth of things and then punishes us when we

do? If we don't know the rules because there aren't any, how can we be punished for breaking them? If this is the nature of God, then what purpose would the Devil fulfil when God is fulfilling it for him?

If you believe that this was the moment when 'sin' first came into the world, then how could 'sin' come from God when God has set us no rules to break? If Eve eating the apple somehow let 'sin' into the world and, 'sin' coming into the world was outside of the control of God, then is there more than one God again? How can sin be from the Devil when the Devil only exists in our minds? All of this only leaves that again, man conceived the concept of sin.

Incidentally, if Jesus came into the world to relieve us of our burden of sin, why do we still sin and why would God punish Jesus on our behalf? Again, what sort of a God is this?

If the books of the religions all say that they are the word of God and the only right way yet are in such dire conflict with themselves and with each other, then how can any of them be complete or right/holy? Holy means complete and, being that everything is constantly evolving, how can anything ever be complete?

God is not complete or holy. Nothing is and nor is anything meant to be. It is just more illusion and deception to make you think that you are beneath God and not with God. God has given free will and has no needs so is God sometimes wrong, contradictory or lying about God's word depending upon whom God is speaking with?

Which Christians are listening to the word of God? The ones who talk of "*an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth.*" or the ones who talk of turning the other cheek? How could both be listening the word of God if the word of God is supposed to be complete/holy?

Does God have a desire to lie to some and not to others? Liberal Christians who may argue that the New Testament makes the Old Testament obsolete are thereby confirming that their faith and its book did at some point reform - it did go through a change to adapt to a new way of thinking. Is it not possible that it could be time for this to happen again but, with all religions?

All of the books including the New Testament all say that God has given us free will, yet if we exercise that free will then we are punished if we make the 'wrong' choices. As this is not free will [because it restricts our choices], how can any of these books be the word of God? If something is given to us without conditions, then there can be no rules or sins or even a hint of them, or we have not been given free will.

Would any Catholic please show me how it is that all humans are born with 'sin' when there are no rules? Even if there were rules, no rules could have been broken just in the act of us being born surely? Are not all souls from God [who is not of sin]?

To summarise; if we are all born with sin and if we are all from God, then this would mean that God is actually the source of all sin and besides this, it's actually good for the soul to be a bit naughty!

In a world where so many of our cultures measure self-worth against financial and/or material gain and not much else [thanks to Western imperialism and conservative outlooks], so much pressure is placed upon us during our day-to-day living that we do not realise that most of us are simply surviving and not actually living. Our maximising capitalist systems and so-called 'representative' democracies ensure that we are oppressed to such a point, that we can't see things for what they truly are. For example; In the UK, we do not see that we actually live in a theocracy, and not a democracy.

It is not within human nature to have our free will restricted to this point by others or by ourselves and, I don't see a single reason for why it's not okay to do anything we

choose to do as long as it doesn't affect anything else alive in a way that we ourselves wouldn't want to be affected. While we spend our lives trying to please everyone [which is impossible because everyone has different expectations of us] and trying to do the 'right' thing, to be a bit naughty from time to time and to do things we wouldn't normally do in fear of being judged by others who wouldn't even be affected by us being naughty, is healthy because it relieves the pressure of the oppression that is placed upon the soul when 'living' in such an oppressive world.

Everything consists of both negative and positive elements and this is what makes anything whole. The negative affects of eating a cake can be outweighed to some degree by the pleasure gained from the enjoyment of the experience. This is healthy for the soul and the more we enjoy each moment in life, the healthier we will be and we would be healthier because all dis-ease is caused by emotional distress. All physical symptoms of any dis-ease actually represent the nature of the emotional distress so, treating the cause of the distress will often cure the dis-ease and the associated physical symptoms will disappear.

The extent to which anything in life can be measured as for its positive/negative effects is best left to individual perception and choice as we are all different. How something may affect one person may be different to how it affects another [as with drugs for example], and so it is an individual decision to be made in alignment with free will.

Do not do onto others as you would want done onto you because, you don't know that others would want for the same as you so, better and safer to not do to others what you already know you would not want done to you. Doing onto others in any way affects others directly but not doing anything to others has no direct effect that would be of your own singular responsibility.

From the moment we are born we are dying so why not learn to enjoy life whilst we have it by real-ising that we are already free and that God is always with us regardless of how we choose to behave - there are no conditions with God's love.

A tool that I created in my late teens to help me with making key decisions was to project into the future and imagine being on my deathbed looking back to my present moment. I imagine the potential results and observe how I would feel for making a decision either way and I start to real-ise what I want to choose. Doing this future imagination-projection changes the perspective of the moment and therefore the potential decisions I could make. It widens my perspective to one that is more in-line with the grand scheme of things as opposed to just the scheme of things in that moment. I see the bigger picture and I believe I make a more worthwhile decision.

Expanding our religions

To expand your perception of God, you do not have to convert, revert or de-convert from any particular religion itself. You do not have to stop or start doing anything that you currently choose to do or not to do in the name and practice of your religion and, you do not have to rebel against your religion, its followers or its 'leaders'. All you have to do is question anything that you think, read or hear about God, against the notion of God having no needs. Re-member that the 'Devil' doesn't exist and that the nature of 'evil' is only fear and guilt, and so no one is your enemy unless you choose to make them so. If someone treats you as their enemy, it is up to you how you choose to perceive them and their actions against you and, how you respond is also up to you. For example; If you can see the fear that drives them to perceive you as an enemy, then you've created an additional option and so can try to deal with their fear. Consider not doing anything to anything else alive that you wouldn't want done to yourself and know that God is with you always regardless of what you think, say or do and will never punish you but will always only love you.

If all religions were to eliminate anything from within their books that contradicts the notion that God has no needs, then ALL of the world's religions would be expanded and therefore, closer to unity through a new understanding of a new God who has no need or desire to judge, condemn and punish. Instead, this God simply wishes for you to know that this God does not need or desire for you to fear it because, this God only ever wants to be your friend [would you really like it if the ones you loved feared you?]. This God will never leave or reject you and will always only love you [be connected to you] regardless of what you do or don't do because this God is not and has never been separate too you [you are part of this God, not separate] and because this God is concerned only for the essence [well-being] of your soul and not for your behaviour [this doesn't affect God, it affects us].

This God has no need for anyone to believe in it because this God created everything and so can not be threatened by anything that you or anything else believes or doesn't believe and, because this God's love comes with no conditions. This God will never cause you pain or suffering because this God knows that pain causes more pain and, the non-existence of the 'Devil' and 'evil' [it is mismanaged fear and guilt that are the masters of disguise] means that the only Hell that you can experience will be a self-induced, self-created, guilt-influenced state of mind experienced in accordance with your own free will and, when you realise that this is what you are experiencing and that God does not wish for you to suffer and wishes to heal you, you will choose to let go and then guess where you'll be?

This is how you can reform your religion and change the world simply by starting a process of personal individual change from within, without having to change anyone or anything outside of yourself.

Establishing yet another religion or group of any kind in the name of any new outlook would be counter-productive because fragmentation between humans creates disunity. The disunity creates fear and the fear creates illusions and these illusions influence people to respond to the actions of others in a deluded way.

As humans consciously enjoying a renewed relationship with God and with each other, we would all be united and as one by default. We would rethink [re-cognise] our perception of God and of each other and we would become awakened members of [we would re-member] the human race.

Some religions have never reformed so for example, when it was written into the Qur'an that it was okay for men to have multiple wives and not okay for women to

have multiple husbands, this was to address a population imbalance between the genders at that time. The times have changed and the reason that validated this no longer exists, yet Islam can not address this because there are no words about what to do for when the population rebalances and so it is resistant to reform because it lacks direction for current times. The Qur'an was written at a specific time and for a specific world but this world has changed drastically meaning that the Qur'an [a book written by just one man while under the illusion that he was taking doctrine from an angel of a God who existed before everything] has run out of words. It has nothing to say about how to live in modern times and so has nothing to say about why men can still choose to have multiple wives when women can not choose to have multiple husbands – even when the gender imbalance is no longer an issue.

Some non-Muslims are so threatened by their perception of the Qur'an and of Islam that they seek to actually outlaw the Qur'an itself but, doing so would amount to direct oppression and would only serve to make Muslims feel more threatened than they already do. This in-turn would breed more fear which would ultimately lead to social breakdown and violence because, it is the right of anyone to be able to choose his or her own faith and to follow its book if they so choose. The power of any resistance will always at some point become equal to the power of oppression and so anti-Islamic oppression will only generate more of what non-Muslims fear.

Basic survival instinct shows that when any animal is pushed into a corner, it will lash out and if someone feels that they have nothing to lose or have lost it all anyway, they will be more likely to lash out. Whilst acts of violence can be reasoned [even if not justified], the reactions of one person are related to the actions of another and so this means that we are all in some way part-responsible for inter-religious fear, violence and terrorism.

Through racist, oppressive, imperialistic foreign policy, non-Muslims are part responsible for the creation of Islamic terrorism and until this is acknowledged by Western cultures, moderate Islam will not take any responsibility for its 'hijackers' and the cycle will continue. The 'non-believers' give extremist Muslims the reasons and influences [even if not the justification] to choose to do what they do because by invading Islamic countries with lies, propaganda and Western democracy hypocrisy and, by oppressing the expression of the Islamic faith, the West becomes part responsible. Terrorists are not born 'evil' and are instead twisted into becoming 'evil' by their perceptions and experiences of the actions of both non-Muslims and other Muslims alike.

According to the Qur'an, any Muslim who kills either another Muslim or a non-combatant [of any faith] is no longer a Muslim and according to Islam, this is how and why there is no such thing as an Islamic terrorist but, it is actually the indoctrination of the moderates that the extremists have expanded upon so as to be able to take the actions that they do.

Muslims who argue that Western media propaganda is attempting to encourage non-Muslims into believing that ALL Muslims are terrorists and who as evidence, sight that the IRA were never labelled as Catholic terrorists, fail to see that this was because the IRA fought for Ireland – not for Catholicism.

The people using the name of Allah and Islam to 'justify' their actions of violence [in any circumstances] against other Muslims and non-combatants are not Muslim [according to the Qur'an] but, these people are expanding [not hijacking] Islam to further their own political agendas and the same has happened with Christianity. The political and spiritual 'leaders' lie to us about the word of God to scare and oblige us into seeing each other as enemies. They push and twist us into killing others and ourselves [in the name of God] and they scare us with the wrath of God and of Allah

should we dare to question them - yet they will be keeping their hands clean. They are using us to do their dirty work and in our blindness and fear we believe that we are enemies but, it is an illusion created by a minority of scared but influential men. We are all choosing to be sucked into a long-standing political and religious family feud and we are choosing to fall for it by choosing not to question the instigators.

During the 1980's, when Osama Bin Laden and the US government were best of buddies and the CIA was creating, training and equipping Al'Qaeda to do the US government's dirty work against the Russians in Afghanistan, the UK government under Thatcher was selling chemical weapons to Saddam Hussain - which he used to kill over five thousand of his own people.

The motives for these actions from Western governments lies in the distribution and control of oil wealth, construction wealth, income from weapons sales, population control and strategic military desires. With families such as the Rothschilds and Rockefellers manipulating law makers from the outset, each government incites its predominant religion for support and so it has now become a war of religion and of 'good' and 'evil' and we are being fooled, used and lied to while refusing to take responsibility for our country's systems of governance.

There is still not a single democracy in the world because no county has yet chosen a system of majority people-oriented control. Most cultures still favour a form of 'representative' democracy but, it is never representative because all laws are decided by a minority that is often now also elected by a minority. Other cultures still choose to remain within the control of overt dictatorships while others like the UK are still a theocracy, where laws have to go before the religions before being voted into common law. Theocracies are the most dangerous form of government because theocracies disguise themselves as 'representative' democracies, as opposed to all of the world's dictatorships which are acknowledged as such.

Despite the advances in communications technology, even those who say that they want and support democracy [in any form], have a problem with their fellow citizens deciding upon common law and so will not yet choose to reform to direct democracy. They instead prefer to empower others to make decisions on their behalf and to then complain when those who they elected [who are not problem solvers] fail to solve problems and until the world chooses to reform to direct democracy, the tyranny of the minority and of the religions will continue.

In the 1990's, the US government commissioned a task-team with finding ways to maintain US global dominance as a super power in the new century to come. This was called the Project for the New American Century [PNAC] and it surmised that in order for America's power and influence to continue, America would have to source new oil suppliers and so they propositioned the Taliban in Afghanistan. There is a bloodline linkage between many past Presidents of the US - George Bush Junior finished off Daddy's mess with Saddam [after a quick chat with 'God'] and this happened after the Taliban ignored the US government's threats of carpet-bombing if they didn't supply the US exclusively with the spoils of the Afghan-Russian conflict over oil.

The Taliban called their bluff and the US needed an excuse to invade Afghanistan [to see through its threat] and so waited for an opportunity [a new Pearl Harbour] and, along comes one when in 2000, the Saudi government warned the US that it had intelligence of an impending Al'Qaeda attack on American soil using aircraft. What a convenient coincidence that Bin Laden was in Afghanistan at the time of 9/11 - along with the Taliban.

The US government and the neo-conservative Jews did not actually need to commit the atrocities of 9/11 themselves [as many conspiracy theorists believe] but, being that the US government was aware of the soon to occur attack, it would have had

much opportunity to capitalise from it by keeping quiet about what it knew and by adding to the event itself and, by using it as an excuse to hit back at the Taliban in Afghanistan for refusing to sell its oil to the US on the cheap.

Western military intervention in Iraq, Afghanistan and Libya was never about justice or about ridding 'mad' dictators of the weapons that we initially sold to them. Iraq produced oil and stopped selling it in US Dollars, Libya produced oil and was about to introduce full public participation into their political system and, the West needed to liberate weapons for supply to Al'Qaeda across Arabia and the Middle East and, Afghanistan refused to sell its oil to the US – at any price!

These wars are not about democracy liberating 'victims' from dictatorships. If these wars were about bringing freedom and democracy, the US, the UK and their allies would first at least become democracies themselves and, would then be warring in Tibet, Sudan, Zimbabwe, Sri Lanka, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Qatar, Israel and many other countries. It is Western countries that oppress democracy around the world by denying its true definition while dictating who has the right to self-determination and who doesn't.

Russia did not invade Ukraine or even Crimea. It was invited [something that Western governments wouldn't understand] by the Crimean Parliament to protect its people from the illegal Western-backed armed minority over-throw of the elected Ukraine government [based in the capital Kiev].

In response to their fears of being ruled by an illegal Nazi coup 'government', the Crimean people voted by almost 97% to become part of Russia and in response to this, US President Obama said that *"Russia in Crimea was worse than the US in Iraq."*

In this twisted and surreal statement, Obama actually tries to sell to us that the Russian government's legal, political and geographical acceptance and annexation of Crimea was worse than the illegal and uninvited US-led invasion that orphaned half a million Iraqi children and murdered approximately one million civilians and – all on the back of Tony Blair's fucking lies!

As well as illegally over-throwing the elected government Of Ukraine by use of violence [while labelling this action as 'democracy'], the US denies that a nation of people choosing to hold their own vote regarding how they would like to be ruled is democracy and so, when US and Western governments can be so blatant about their twisted perception of democracy, thank fuck for Russia!

* *note:* PNAC info and transcripts of conversations between US diplomats and the Afghan Taliban were sourced from documents released by the US State Department under the Freedom of Information Act prior to 9/11.

Is it also no coincidence that members of the US and UK governments, The OPEC nations, Al'Qaeda, the Taliban, the Russian government [in Chechnya] and the Chinese government [in Tibet] all share interests in oil, infrastructure and control over others. How do you create markets for construction and control people of other religions who are 'wrong'? Go and blow apart their country, install your own 'democratic' government and keep the people divided and fighting under the illusion that they are all enemies of course! [Shia and Sunni, Hindu and Sikh, Hamas and Fatah etc].

George Bush's Poodle-bitch Tony Blair lied to the entire world [and removed the director general of the BBC when it wouldn't broadcast his Iraq war propaganda] so as to climb deeper into George Bush Junior's arse hole. How ironic that Tony Blair is now a so-called Middle East 'Peace' Envoy after helping to mash the place up even further! With George Bush Junior's mother dragging him to Sunday School throughout his childhood and programming him with the notion that he was the Return of the Christ

by telling him that *"When they say Jesus that means you."* it seems as if all these players think that they are actually the Return of the Christ. They are all expanding the doctrine of the moderates so as to control ALL of us and we are doing their dirty work for them - we are choosing to be played.

In front of the eyes of the world, the Israeli government evicts Palestinians from their homes and turns them onto the streets whilst moving extremist Jews on to their land. Isn't this conscious provocation and government-led incitement?

As Bin Laden himself said; *"Mr Obama and George Bush had caused animosity in Islamic states. They have planted seeds of hatred and revenge against America. Let the American people prepare to reap what has been planted by the heads of the White House."*

By exercising our free will we can all take responsibility and control right now simply by reforming our political systems in to direct democracies.

When do our 'leaders' ever die for us?

Achieving unity and freedom

In forming relationships with others, it is easy to accept the aspects that we have in common and seeking commonalities is one of the primary aspects involved in the formation of relationships. It is also easy to deny the existence of any differences but acknowledging and accepting any differences is just as important [if not more important] as acknowledging and accepting any commonalities. Whether it's within business, friendships or between lovers, getting to know and experience the differences is getting to know more of another. What good is it if just one unaccepted difference can eliminate the contribution of all of the commonalities?

A relationship can work well when there are many differences but, only when these differences are accepted but, tolerating differences may also involve compromise and this can potentially lead to self-oppression that could be detrimental. Even if you don't express your frustration, this does not mean that you or the other party will not be affected by it in some way.

If you accept a difference in another, it is not that you have to accept it for yourself or be as they are. It simply means that you can work to find ways by which you will not be affected by the effects of the difference.

For example, if one person smokes and the other does not, the smoker can choose to smoke in a place that won't affect the other. The non-smoker does not have to start smoking and the smoker does not have to stop smoking.

Humans are born with an innate interest in things that are different to them and it is usually only conditioning from the opinions of others that leads some to fear differences instead of to embrace them. While we are divided we are controlled and while we are controlled we are not fully re-cognising and using our freedom.

Freedom is simply the ability to make choices. Whilst we have this ability, we have power. Power is simply the ability to broaden your choices by influencing people and, money is just one of the many tools that can enable for this.

While those within Islam who are Sharia-compliant use their freedom to choose to protest against freedom itself [with slogans such as "*Freedom can go to Hell*"] they demonstrate that they do not even actually understand what this freedom is that they protest against and, they fail to articulate that their resentment is actually towards how Western cultures use this freedom - which is the real issue for these people and also, for many others around the world.

Governments and armies know all too well that the best way to confuse and weaken the 'enemy' is to divide them. If you can get them fighting each other, you distract their focus against you and you can even get some to side with you. This is how the British conquered India and the resulting fighting factions that were once brothers and sisters still fight today - even though the British are no longer in their lands. Ghandi's peaceful national strike strategy put energy into resisting the oppression and eventually the British left but, with India's wealth as part of the deal.

We have just let this happen again in Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya and Syria and the UK is now secretly cultivating Opium after using NATO to destroy the Afghan national product!

The British invaded India because it didn't want to pay the going rate for tea and for spices that were worth more than their weight in gold and this has now happened again but, over oil, reconstruction rights and Opium.

After the second world war, Britain carved-up the Middle East by 'creating' Israel and

then Iraq and by leaving the Palestinians what little was left. The Arab Muslims and Arab Jews that once lived together still fight each other to this day but, as Palestinians and Israelis.

The US and UK governments continue even today to supply Israel with arms while talking of recognising the plight of the Palestinians. They say that they will recognise any democratically elected government in the world but when the people of Palestine chose to elect an organisation that the US and the UK didn't like [Hamas], they changed their minds and reneged upon this and refused to recognise the choice of the Palestinian people [just as with both Crimea and Venice in 2014]. The US also continually denies the extent of civilian deaths caused by its operations in both Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan and offers no accountability and because there is no accountability, families of the civilian dead get no appeasement and so the civilian population becomes frustrated. This frustration turns to anger and the anger turns to action and we then label this action as 'terrorism'. Who is really being terrorised? Isn't it the people of all nations who are suffering whilst the 'leaders' play us all for sheep?

I believe that the popular vote for Hamas cast in Palestine's first ever general election was actually a protest vote but, not a protest against another Palestinian representative, but a protest against the US and UK. After all, Hamas have a history of securing very little in exchange for the Palestinian lives that are expended by the Israeli bombings that it provokes but, Hamas is the only Palestinian movement to continue any form of military action against aggressors since the Palestinian Liberation Army renounced terrorism.

During the Iran-Iraq war in the 1980's, the US government secretly supplied intelligence and arms simultaneously to both parties while the British government supplied WMDs to Iraq. Doesn't this make the British government a state sponsor of terrorism? Is it really so difficult to see how all of this looks like an ongoing Christian crusade against Islam even if it isn't?

It's strange that when the poor and suffering leave their decimated lands for England for a better life, how we abuse and reject them when it's us who have contributed to them being so poor in the first place. They have chosen to come to the country that stole their resources so as to try to benefit, yet we tell them to "*go home!*" even if they were born here and therefore are already home. They could have chosen to do as we did and invade us militarily but they have not chosen to do this.

Re-cognising that God has no needs and that we have free will while re-cognising that our only true enemies are fear and guilt, is what will enable reform and unity between all peoples of all religions – simply through a new outlook of God and therefore of each other. Violence or revolution is not necessary and will never bring about lasting balanced inclusive solutions. We do not have to be divided and controlled by a minority of scared men with their God of war and punishment any longer if we don't want to be. We can deal with our fear and guilt individually and if we don't fear or judge each other then we could only love each other because that's all that would be left to do. Fuck! We might even be happy?

If the religious realised that the only eternal common message of all of their 'prophets' was that; we can do anything that we choose but best not to affect anything else alive in a way that we would not wish for ourselves, they would leave their judgement to God. If we re-cognise that we could ALL have more than we need and released the fear that drives greed and out of control egos, we would share and give more to each other and there would be less need for ownership of items and currency and therefore less reason to work. If we weren't working we wouldn't be bored - we would be happy. If we weren't working we would be living instead of simply surviving and we would be partaking only in activities that we enjoyed and this

would be productive for all. We would be exploring and expressing ourselves by being ourselves and enjoying it and others would benefit from this too. Direct democracies would ensure the implementation of truly democratic laws until eventually, there would be no crimes or 'sins' and so no need for any rule of law.

Why does God need for us to believe in the books without question when God has no needs and when we have free will? Isn't it just other humans that have the [perceived] need for us to do this?

Which 'messenger' was listening to the word of God - the one who says that images of the prophet and of Allah are an offence to Allah, or the one who says that God has given us Art and humour as mediums of self-expression and that God's and prophets can't be offended because they are invulnerable? Couldn't we all exercise tolerance when others are expressing, so that we can then also enjoy the same rights of expression too? Which outlook fits with a God who urges tolerance and forgiveness and who has no needs and can not therefore be threatened by anything?

Incidentally, British Muslims who assemble in their thousands across the country in protest at the publishing of artwork that depicts their prophet, do nothing to fight the law that allows ONLY Muslim children to be hit by teachers in schools and do nothing to fight David Cameron's policy of funding the Syrian FSA while they use a fatwa to rape and murder Muslim children. Many British Muslims fight with the FSA in Syria apparently to protect Muslims but, the opposing army that they fight against is also Islamic and, is also of the host of that country and, to do either is against the teachings of Islam.

If someone expressing an opinion [through art for example] offends you, then you are offended because at some level you would have chosen to be offended and it is conditioned into you to react in this way to what you perceive to be offensive by those around you. When someone offends you through their self expression, they are not actually doing anything to you and if you don't like what you're seeing or hearing, you have the choice to not look or to not listen - your TV has an Off button and your radio can be tuned into another station!

It is tolerance that allows others to exercise their free will to express while you exercise yours and, this is why tolerance is crucial because tolerance hinges the whole deal together. You may not consciously re-cognise that you are choosing to be offended but that does not mean that the choice isn't being made at a deeper level. Feeling offended comes from feeling under attack. It comes from fear and is a defensive mechanism but, you have the choice in how you react.

If you wanted to say something that even in your opinion was offensive to others, why should you be prevented from doing so simply because they do not share your opinion - especially when they can choose not to accept or not to even listen? What if you didn't think that what you wanted to say was offensive? Do you really feel that it is okay, that you can't say something because others choose to take offence when in your opinion, you're not even being offensive and, when they can choose not to even listen? Would it not be fair that you can say whatever it is that you want to say and the person who chooses to take offence can instead choose not to listen? Is this not how both you and the 'offended' person both exercise free will without affecting the other? If you do think that this is fair, then doesn't it have to work both ways?

Offence affects only a person's ego - not their well-being.

Working with African and Jamaican-oriented music over many years, I've spent much time listening to fellow artists, sound engineers and producers from ethnic cultures slamming white culture, history, politics and ethics. Sometimes it would be quite aggressive but they weren't targeting me - I just happened to be there. I did at first

sometimes feel offended but I realised that these guys were just having their say, expressing their view from their own experiences and perceptions in their own way. I began to feel privileged to be present during these conversations - I could have walked out for a coffee or a cigarette at any time if I was 'offended' but I chose to stay and listen. Further more, I started to learn of things that don't come from books and that don't get published in the mainstream media and I feel that I have benefited myself by acquiring this knowledge. If I had chosen to be offended, I would have denied myself this insight and education.

If someone offends your God, let them! God would not choose to become offended and God has no needs and so no vulnerabilities and so can not be offended or threatened anyway. Let them because God has given free will to all. Let them because your God desires that you exercise tolerance when others are expressing. Let them because your God does not desire that you oppress their free will that your God has given to them. Let them so that you may learn of their fears. Let them because it shows them how to tolerate you. Let them because your God desires that we equally all have access to the same rights.

If a belief system was so accurate and we had faith in it, why would we have the desire to be so defensive when others 'offend' it? How can we claim to have an understanding of God's love and messages of peace and tolerance when we use violence to try to make any point about God or God's love?

If the religious feel the need to attack others just to defend their beliefs about their God, why are they feeling so threatened to have to do this when God has no need for protection because nothing can threaten God? Do they maybe at some deeper level know that there is actually something to question about what they have been told about the nature of God?

If what they believe is so 'right' and so solid, why then would they feel the need to defend it by betraying its message of peace and tolerance? If religion is so 'right', why do followers feel the need to attack me for anything I write or question here [for example]? If their faith is so 'right' and their God is all-powerful, then I'm sure it will survive any questions or attacks from me.

Which 'messengers' do we believe were relaying the word of God - the ones who justify war in an offended God's name, or the ones who promote peace and forgiveness in God's name?

With regards to insulting prophets, Islamic clerics and Grand Muftis of many Islamic nations will specifically say themselves that it is not possible to offend Allah or his prophet, that Jihad is about fighting the 'evil' [fear, guilt and pain] within and that no war is a holy war and that only peace is holy. When moderate Muslims ignores this message they become in principal, no different to the men of violence who they say are hijacking their religion and who also use Islam as an excuse for violence.

Muslims who ignore this message who are motivated in their 'Jihad' by the prospect of receiving seventy two virgins upon entry into Heaven, are clearly motivated by sexual self-gratification over anything else [which is forbidden in the Qur'an - unless a wife is refusing her husband's sexual demands of course]. Also, there is no mention of the gender of these virgins and, no mention of how a celestial virgin can even have sex in the first place [as he/she will have no physical body]?

Where does it come from that it is a 'sin' for a Muslim to listen to Western or modern music? Why would Allah fear for this when Allah has no needs? Is it not Islamic men who would fear this? It is Muslim men who do not want Muslims to listen to modern music because they fear the power and influence of other ideas coming to Muslims without words that they can not control the interpretation of.

Music is a universal language [we can all feel the sadness of a minor chord and the happiness of a major chord] that uses the expression and translation of emotion to bypass using words. This means that you are free to decide upon your own interpretations and perceptions of what you hear, feel, or sense on any level. When people fear us being open to other ideas, it is usually a sign that these people are not so sure themselves of their own ideas and so they become insecure and they fear that they may lose control over you.

Music is a threat to these people because music can encourage unity.

Which 'messengers' do we believe were relaying the word of God - the ones who persecuted others for their sexuality, or the ones who promote peace and free-loving without discrimination?

Why would God care how we expressed our love to each other and to whatever sex, when God has no needs and desires only that we love each other without discrimination?

Not in any of the religious books does God ever say how we are to define love or how and who we are to express love to. God has given us free will then how can it have conditions attached? If there are any statements regarding conditions or terms of loving in any of the books, then they would contradict statements that say that God has given us free will and wants for us to all love each other. Why would God need to restrict the expression of our love when we all have free will and when the only love that God has forever expressed to us is unrestricted?

Which 'messengers' were in touch with God? The ones who wrote about same-sex relationships being a 'sin', or the ones who wrote about God wanting us to love each other without conditions or discrimination?

Christianity and Islam both state that Jesus encouraged all to love all, without discrimination - and then state that if we express love to another of the same sex we will be punished. Apparently, the omnipotent God of free love will be affected in some fundamental way by this even though both religions state that Jesus encouraged ONLY free, undiscriminating love?

All UK common laws that aim [or aimed] to restrict or block private sexual interactions within homosexual relationships are derived purely from the Christian idea of 'sin'. Not one religious book defines what love is or how to express it [they all leave this for us to define ourselves] so therefore, no 'sin' can be committed through any consented act or expression of love.

The religions specifically state that homosexuality is bad for the body and bad for the soul and they say that this is because homosexuality is unnatural and is therefore also against God.

Regarding homosexuality being harmful to the body, homosexuality is an attitude/orientation and not an act in itself and therefore, can not on its own be assessed to be neither safe nor harmful. Regarding homosexuality being harmful to the soul, neither religion nor science have yet to establish the existence of the soul and although research in quantum mechanics is currently getting closer to doing this than the religions ever will, it is still a belief and so, the effects of anything upon the soul can not be categorically stated by anyone because they can not [as yet] be measured. What would surely be harmful to the soul and to the emotional mind is oppressing itself so as to conform to the judgements of others who are not even affected by the desires and acts of such a soul.

Within the restricted confines of religious belief systems, it is not necessary for the religious to require proof of the existence of the soul but, when logic can replace belief to the point that logic alone amounts to proof [such as for example; God having no

needs if God created everything], a refusal of the religious to modify their belief systems is no more than a denial of obvious truths shown through logic alone.

It is known that Adolf Hitler was an artist and that he was brought-up by a staunchly Jewish uncle and, that this uncle used religious doctrine and violence to prevent Adolf from expressing himself through his art. With this in mind, it is obvious that this oppression became part of the subconscious conditioning that shaped Adolf into the person who grew-up despising Jews so much that he launched a war against them but, while historians blame Adolf Hitler for the 'evil' atrocities of World War Two, they omit to comment on the millions of German soldiers who all made an individual choice to adhere to Adolf's philosophy and conviction, and to do his dirty work for him.

With religious oppression of the soul's expression being the root cause of World War Two and with this same oppression constantly aimed at others, the religions demonstrate that they actually understand very little about the nature of the soul, never mind the nature of their 'God'.

Regarding homosexuality being unnatural; everything that occurs or exists in this universe is natural because in this universe, everything that occurs or exists is a derivative of nature. Every synthetic chemical is derived from something natural. Every 'unnatural' product is derived from nature. Humans are a derivative and part of nature and so, regardless of how pretty or ugly, positive or negative any human expression or act may be, if it is expressed by humans [something that derives from nature], it is natural.

Regarding homosexuality being against God; half of this argument stems from homosexuality being unnatural [explained above] while the other half is oriented in conditioning people into believing that God has needs but, the religions state that God created everything and was already in existence before anything and so such a God would therefore be vulnerable to nothing and, nothing can threaten or be against anything that has no vulnerabilities.

The 'compassionate' predominant religions were the first to claim [early 1980's] that AIDS was a form of punishment from God for the 'sin' of homosexuality and if this was true, the religious God does not care for the deaths of women and children [collateral damage] because, AIDS does not discriminate such as the religions do.

Whilst many Christians say they are neutral regarding the judgement of homosexuality - claiming extremist Pastors such as Kevin Swanson [for example] do not represent modern-day Christianity, it is them who are in denial because as a Christian and whether they like it or not, the doctrine is strictly against homosexuality and so, these 'progressives' are actually no-longer Christians but, in failing to recognise that we ALL have an on-going connection and relationship with a God who exists outside of religion, they fail to see that it is Jesus who they now follow and not the Bible or Christianity and so, they still falsely consider themselves to be Christians.

How is it a threat to God if two people choose to share and express love [by their own definition] through sex outside of wedlock? Is God so weak and needy?

How is it a threat to God if two people choose to share and express fun and pleasure [in accordance with their own definition] through sex and outside of wedlock or outside of what some would judge as love? Is God so weak and needy?

How is anything a threat to the almighty pre-existing God?

How does it offend God that we may feel pleasure when conceiving children? Why do religious men keep using God's name to turn life into pain when God is love and life? We do not, and have never had to associate pain with gain - it is another illusion.

Throughout the world, there are Christian cultures that use the 'word of God' to justify

mutilating the genitalia of their female children so that they don't enjoy having sex when they're older. Somehow it is a 'sin' for a woman to enjoy the same sexual pleasures as a man. Is God a sexist who encourages physical, emotional and sexual female child abuse? Isn't it more likely that these 'brave' men of God are actually being weak cowardly hypocrites who get-off on child mutilation and abuse as part of their oppression of women? Is this not the same for the self-appointed European 'witch hunters' of the 16th and 17th centuries?

In the Qur'an, it states that there is no such thing as rape within marriage because apparently and according to Allah, it is the duty of every Muslim wife to submit to her husbands sexual desires at any time of his 'asking' [demanding]. A Muslim woman should always be willing to give sexual pleasure to her husband as this is her duty - regardless of her will. The Qur'an also states that it is acceptable to Allah for a husband to beat his wife if she disobeys him. Does this really feel like the word of a free and fair loving God who has no needs? All of this is written in a book called Peace and that is apparently the word of God - speaking to a man through an 'angel'?

It is religious psychopaths who use the word of 'God' to do things of 'evil' and in our cowardly weakness to not question these people and their motives, we choose to become part responsible and we therefore choose to let this happen. If these things are all of God's will then please, give me Satan any day! If the world is dying because of God and 'his' will, then we don't need to worry about anything that the 'Devil' could do whilst we have a God of this nature being marketed to us by the psychopathic cowards who worship it.

How is circumcision at birth also not child abuse? Doesn't this involve the removal of body parts without the consent of the owner? Is this all not conditioning us whilst we are young and not self-aware so that we do as they wish without questioning for the rest of our lives? Look what happens if we don't - we go to 'Hell'!

The Bible [Proverbs 22:6] regarding brain-washing; *"Train a child in the way he should go, and even when he is old he will not depart from it."*

It is through religious indoctrination that as children we start to learn to judge others, and not just to observe or question. As we get older we get bigger - we grow-up but this doesn't mean that we mature.

Is this also not how cycles of abuse continue? As a child of Islam or Judaism, another over-rode your free will and you were circumcised. As a parent, you then decide that it is okay to do it to your child because throughout your life, you have been conditioned into believing that God requires circumcision and so you have believed that it is acceptable to do this - even though God has no needs?

Is this not what happens when children are abused or shown inappropriate behaviour? They sometimes [not always] grow up conditioned that what happened to them was acceptable and that it is okay or even required, to do to the same to another. Isn't this why such cycles of behaviour continue? If this is so, then many who abuse do not even know that they are abusing as they are simply doing to others as was done to them and in their perception, they are not being 'evil' but are being normal or even loving. When we come to see and understand the cycle of our own abuse [or negative or inappropriate influence of any orientation], we can then choose to either proliferate the abuse [whatever the nature], or we can choose to become a true warrior and fight the fear and guilt within to break potential cycles of negative behaviour.

Regarding the witch-hunting craze that swept across Europe in the sixteenth century and lasted for almost two hundred years, the signs that someone was a witch were actually the misunderstood symptoms of an allergic reaction to poisonous wheat crops. This was caused by moisture retention in particular soil types in various regions

and so witchcraft was seen to spread. The Christian missionaries misinterpreted these so-called 'symptoms' and these misinterpretations were then used as an excuse by the church and the legal system to oppress thousands of innocent women through torture and death. The missionaries deluded belief in the 'Devil' enabled them to create and to project their image of the 'Devil' and of 'evil' onto the allergy sufferers and their belief in the 'Devil' was so strong, that they thought that they were seeing the 'Devil' in others and they therefore made the 'Devil' real but, only in their own stupid fucking self-righteous judgemental heads! Again, the 'men of God' and their 'divine' wisdom who claimed to be special enough to know what God needs of us, didn't even understand basic soil systems - never mind the nature of their own God!

The church and the inquisition in their self-righteousness and in the name of 'God' tortured and murdered thousands of innocent women across Europe completely unchallenged by the people of these religions who followed like sheep without questioning their religious 'leaders'. Today, these same people still tell us what is 'wrong' and 'right' by God [even though God has given us no rules] and still we act like scared sheep passing responsibility onto God, the 'Devil', and others - enabling for the wholesale proliferation of mental, emotional and sexual abuse in the mean time.

Where does the 'evil' come from when your priest or imam tells you that to rid your child of a terrible and 'evil' spirit, that you must starve them - sometimes to death? The thinking that lay behind the witch-craze still exists today in the twisted self-righteous judgements of the 'men of God' who have chosen to ignore that God has no needs of them and us, and that God has given free will to all.

These deluded fuck-wits are the witch hunters of our times and they exist because we choose to give them power over our own relationships with God and each other. These same psychopaths relay God's 'rules' for enjoying pleasure regarding something as intimate as sex and still, their followers won't question them.

Why would God not want for you to enjoy sex? It is part of the human reproductive process so why can't this be celebrated at conception as well as at birth? Don't we talk with God during sexual orgasm... *"Oh my God [Oh my life, Oh my love], "Oh yes, Oh God"*? When we make love with another aren't we also making love with a part of God? Isn't this to be celebrated? Doesn't God love us?

How would it be a threat to God or to anyone if half of the world simultaneously chose to share and express physical sexual pleasure with itself? Do you really think you'd even know if this was to happen? Do you really envisage thousands of people having sex with each other all over your town or city, in your street or house? Do you not realise that the people who want to do this are already doing this now anyway? What does it have to do with you or your religion and why do you bother to judge those who don't even affect you?

How would it threaten, harm or offend God if we all decided to walk around naked? Didn't Adam and Eve have the pleasure? Were we not all naked and didn't we all come into the world naked?

How does it threaten, harm or offend God if a woman is to show too much flesh? Who is to say how much flesh is too much flesh when God has given us free will? Why is it against any religion to do so when it is not against a God who has no needs? Does this not just harm the ego and security of the husband who fears that his wife is not capable of being loyal without his rule and control?

How is it a threat to God if you fall in love with someone of another religion? Why would God need us to love and express 'love' only to people of the same belief system, culture or colour? Why would God want for us to discriminate when expressing love [if possible] when God doesn't discriminate? Why would God need this

if God does not even need us to believe in God? Do we not benefit from sharing information across cultures and religions? Aren't new cultures and outlooks born from the blending, fusion and implementation of new ideas? Is it not just the 'leaders' of the religions who would fear the loss of their control over your choices? Breeding an ideology is the best way to spread an ideology and so 'coincidentally', contraception is also banned – leading to mass-population growth in all countries where Catholicism and Islam root themselves.

If you choose to let your belief system stop you from loving someone or from being with someone simply because their beliefs are different to yours, then what is so weak about your own belief system that you let it stop you from seeing that we are all from God anyway?

Why do you choose to let your fear stop you from sharing company with those who do not think as you do [as if you were so 'right' anyway]?

Whole civilisations have used their free will to empower corrupt minority 'leadership' structures to manage their relationships and their lives for them, while they consume the planet's resources at an unsustainable rate without any regards for the planet's capacity to support so many humans and, all just to protect people and ideas that obviously have something to hide.

If Muslims, Christians, Catholics and Jews are of the same orientation, why can't the peoples of these same faiths express love to each other? Would this not be healing? Wouldn't the sharing of different outlooks benefit us all? Isn't this why the Qur'an encourages its followers to read the books of the other faiths and, to marry outside of the faith?

Why does the Christian 'leadership' discourage the learning of other ideas - especially those of Islam? Who do any of these people think they are that they can override your God-given right to make your own choices about anything? We are letting these people make themselves Gods over us!

We are actually already all in love with each other [in life with each other, in God with each other]. This is our true nature and this is us when without fear and guilt and this is us when we re-cognise God in another. We are ALL already in love with each other and our nature is to express this because love is a process that leads to perceived feelings and then to actions of their expression - love is not a state of mind. Love is what happens when God creates and it is what happens when we create and, it is the energy that is everything and the source of the energy in everything. We are all in love with each other just yearning to real-ise this and to be it but, if we don't real-ise this then we can't express, experience, enjoy and benefit from it.

The moment when we fall in love with another is the moment we see God in them.

Are there laws from God about who we can love, even though all of the books state that God wants us all to love each other and, without discrimination? Is it not possible that as we are all from the same source and are all of love, that anyone could all fall in love with anyone? Isn't anything less simply a 'love' that comes with conditions?

If God desires for us to all love each other without discrimination, then is it not man who has made a 'sin' of this? Is it not the pastors, priests, vicars, bishops, rabbis, spiritual 'leaders', scholars, the 'teachers', imams and the clerics who simply serve their own fears of religious disintegration and loss of control? Is 'sin' not simply part of a man-made control mechanism? All this when God has given us free will, wants us to see God in others [fall in love], and has no needs?

If 'sins' don't affect or threaten God, then who do you think that 'sins' would threaten? How does it harm or offend God if you choose to terminate your pregnancy for any

reason? How exactly would this be a sin? The unborn entity is an embryo, then a foetus and then eventually a baby when it is born. If a baby dies before the delivery process it is a foetus - not a baby or a child. If the process of reincarnation does exist then the soul that would have adopted the unborn life would have known before its birth of what may happen, yet may still have chosen this life because of reasons that could benefit the parents. This life [even though short] would still have had a purpose so, where do the religious self-righteous who don't care for the guilt that comes with terminating a potential life get-off on breaking the laws of their own books to pass their judgement and interfere in the free will given by God to another?

For those of you who as children grew-up [particularly in a religious family] and who were told that your birth was an accident or a mistake, I'd like to re-mind you that even if your birth was unplanned, no one is born by accident or born unwanted and that your parents would have known of the possible consequences of their choices that led to your conception prior to conceiving you. This means that regardless of anything they may ever have said, if they refused the choice [for whatever reason] to terminate - you were wanted. Now that you can see that you were actually wanted, you can choose to not let your parent's denial of their own previous choices effect you and you can focus on making sure that your own children only ever know how much you wanted them - even if they were unplanned.

Our true beliefs are expressed more in the actions we take than in the words we express so, if you were born - you were wanted.

Both Islam and Catholicism condemn abortion but, why would God need for the Catholics and the Christian pro-life extremists to be condemning and judging women who have chosen to do this? In many Catholic countries, the choice of a rape victim will often be over-ridden by religious law and she will be forced to give birth and, if a woman is in need of an abortion based upon medical grounds, she will be denied this and will instead have to endure the consequences - even if this means death.

On the 28th Oct. 2012, an Indian woman who was visiting Ireland suffered a miscarriage and was in need of an abortion to save her own life. A government-ran hospital refused and she subsequently died ten days later. She was not a Catholic, she was not Irish, the baby had already died - yet the 'democracy' of Ireland and its twisted Catholicism LAWFULLY killed her.

In their self-righteousness, the Catholics and extremist Christians are too busy judging and condemning to see that to be pro-life is to be pro-choice and again, if this behaviour is only of God's desire [and not out of need], then how is this a God of love and peace?

If this oppressive behaviour didn't occur within human culture God would still exist and, when the Bible and the Qur'an both state to leave the judgement of others to God alone, who is truly Christian or Muslim anyway?

It is not God who they satisfy but is instead their own fears and guilt that they satisfy. They are self-righteous judgemental bullies who coward behind a God who is never questioned but, this is a God of their own creation and is not a God who has no requirements or needs and it is not a God who has given free will to all. It is not a God of mercy and compassion - it is another human-created illusion.

A God with rules is not a God of no needs and free will - and so therefore is not a God. This tyrannical 'God' is an illusion that these bullying hypocrites have created in order to persecute those who are already persecuting themselves - and all this when the persecutor's own God urges forgiveness, compassion and tolerance?

If you see that God has no needs and that you are free to make your own choices without fear, you can not at the same time believe that God has rules and so if you

still do, then you are confused and do not understand that it is you who makes choices for your life – not God. To be free in any context, means to be without any attachments or conditions. The freedom that we have doesn't come with us having to buy anything - it is not a '10% free' offer that involves you having to give or trade anything in order to have it.

It's that simple. It is so simple that if you do not understand then maybe it is because you just can't comprehend the freedom that has been given to you - just how much God actually loves you? Maybe you have simply not real-ised that you have been exercising this free will in every decision in your life? Maybe you do not re-cognise that it really is okay for you to do anything that you wish - as long as it doesn't do to anything else alive something that you wouldn't want done to you. If you do, humans may punish you but God won't.

When you ask someone what animal they would be if they could choose to be an animal, do you notice that most people would choose to be a bird or a dolphin? Why do you think this is? Do these animals not represent freedom and the experience of it? We yearn to experience freedom [the ability to make choices] but only because we don't re-cognise that we already have it. What restricts our experience of freedom is our limited perception of it and how we make the choices that we do make because regardless of what any other may do to us, ultimately it is us who choose to restrict or expand our freedom.

How does it harm or offend God if you choose to use your free will to end your own life? If you judged that your life was too painful too endure, why would God want for you to continue to suffer? Why would God need or desire for this? Suicide can not be a 'sin' because nothing we do can ever be against God because God has no needs and therefore no vulnerabilities. Wouldn't a loving and intelligent God only desire for us that for wherever we are and in whatever form, that we be happy or at least have purpose to our lives outside of suffering? Only pain and delusion is created from suffering.

How is it that it is a 'sin' and a crime to commit suicide, when the self-consumption of alcohol and cigarettes is accepted by some religions as well as by most societies and governments? Is this not actually state-assisted suicide? Are governments and corporates not encouraging us to kill ourselves and to pay for it in the process, whilst denying us this right ourselves? To me, it is laughable how if we pay money for the right to kill ourselves by their means it is then legally and socially acceptable but, if we leave their products out of the equation, the same act then becomes a 'sin' and a crime.

In allowing motorists to poison the atmosphere for others, are we not allowing for state-sanctioned mass murder? Carbon Monoxide emissions from vehicles kill approximately sixty thousand people every year in the UK alone.

Whilst we have given ourselves the legal right to end the life of others through the act of abortion and, through polluting our atmosphere, it is perverse and hypocritical that we are denied the opportunity to take the same decision for ourselves - even more so if we want to consider endorsing capital punishment. Christian law [and therefore common law] dictates to all that regardless of the quality of your life and of your right to form an opinion of the quality of your life, you must endure and suffer without dignity until you die by other means and, you can thank the unelected Christian bishops in the House of Lords for that!

Why would it be a need for God to punish you further? What purpose would it serve? It could not serve a God of love who has no needs and has given us free will [love without conditions]. Wouldn't a God who has no needs just love you, or do you think that God would benefit from hurting you? If God doesn't need for you to suffer then

do you think that God would desire this for you? If God does not need for you to suffer then what sort of 'God' of love would desire for you to suffer?

Why would it be a need or a desire for God that at any stage of your life [or death even], that you endure suffering to any degree? What do we do with our pets when we believe that their life will be not much more than continued pain and suffering? We have free will so obviously, God has left the choice of ending our current life with us alone.

On this basis, why should a wife who suffers abuse from her husband continue to stay in the marriage for religious reasons? Why does it have to be "*for worse*"? Why should any partner obey the commands of the other? Maybe ALL relationships are just for a time or a purpose and not necessarily to be forever [basically, everyone is Mr or Miss Right] so, why would God want for anyone to endure an abusive marriage?

In the case of the forced marriages of Muslims and according to Sharia law, only others outside of the marriage can permit the divorce. In its hypocrisy and contrary to its own laws, the Qur'an states that Allah rejects forced marriages but if this was true, why do Muslim women have to endure years of abuse while awaiting permission for divorce from others within Islam and Sharia councils?

If it is true that forced marriages are against the Qur'an and are merely a cultural aspect and not a religious aspect, why do forced marriages occur ONLY within Islamic cultures? Coincidence? Bullshit!

If marriage is about having our union with another recognised and blessed by God then aren't the rules or terms of the marriage to be defined between each couple [if they so choose]?

If we all have free will because God is invulnerable, then isn't an open marriage just as relevant to God as a monogamous marriage - especially if the couple have openly and honestly agreed upon such an arrangement? If the rules or terms of each marriage are determined by each couple using their own free will, isn't it simply honesty that is important? How do our choices offend God when God has given us free will and has no needs? In this example, why would it be a 'sin' or a threat to the almighty God for one partner to express love through sex even with someone who is not their spouse?

Honesty would enable both partners to be themselves and to enjoy the experiences of their marriage and their own life path and if God gave us free will then how can another restrict something that even God wouldn't restrict? They can't - only we can do this.

Isn't it up to us ONLY to either accept or deny the behaviour of our partner - but not to restrict it? If we don't like something that our partner wishes to do, we have the choice to step away or to compromise and tolerate but, how do we have the right to interfere in the free will that God gave to another person? Honesty allows both partners to know the truth and the shared reality of their marriage at all times so that both can be themselves at all times and therefore still have a valuable union.

Why should you seek the permission of your partner to do something that has nothing to do with them and that doesn't directly affect them? Would you even want to be with someone who didn't at least encourage your desires - regardless of what they are? Throughout my life, I have met so many musicians who have made a bad habit out of asking for permission from their wives and husbands to go and play their instrument. I have met many smokers who despite being smokers before meeting their current partners, have to argue and justify their will to smoke but, they only experience this oppression because they choose to remain in such relationships and so, they are literally asking for it. Speaking for myself, I have never been with a

partner who didn't encourage me with my music. At worst, I had one who was just completely neutral but none ever tried to stop me being a musician and, I couldn't imagine asking permission from anyone to play my instrument or to do anything that didn't directly affect them. It is on this basis that I ignore all UK common law when it comes to making my own choices and I instead, try to consider how my choices could negatively affect others. In my opinion, this does not make me a criminal - it makes me responsible and considerate. I do not need religious-influenced common laws or the fear of God to dictate to me how I should behave.

If falling in love is the moment when we re-cognise God in another and if God is with everyone then isn't it possible to feel love for more than one person at the same time? It's up to us how we want to experience and express that love - if at all. We may be happy to just acknowledge and share in it through friendship or even just through a smile. Simply feeling and re-cognising love in or from another on it's own is not a threat to a marriage or to any intimate union and, it is the religions themselves that state that God desires that we all love each other [all see God in each other] and, without discrimination.

If the basis of marriage is actually just honesty, then this means that there are many marriages out there that have occurred without any certification or religious processes involved. There are many marriages out there that exist even without the couple involved knowing it exists! Is it not possible to have a union with another that may actually be more honest than some religious marriages? Is being married through religious ceremony the only way to have an honest relationship? Take a look around and you'll see that its not.

If marriage is about commitment then how is it that some relationships outside of wedlock never betray their commitments while many conventional marriages end in divorce due to the betrayal of these? A marriage outside of religion may be 'immoral' but, it is no less or no more committed, valuable and ethical than marriages within religion so, how do the religious get-off on judging and condemning the relationships of the 'non-believers' as being of less value or, to be affecting God's well-being?

It is men who want others to endure and to suffer because it suits their fears and their needs, not God's because God has no needs and therefore no fears. We don't actually have any needs either because even if we die through lack of any perceived needs, we will still continue to exist in some form. This is why it is impossible for the soul to die - it can only evolve. When we die in physical life we just lose physical density [we change form] and our conscious focus shifts. We don't cease to exist because even if we were no-thing then we would still be some-thing because nothing is in itself something and if we were ever in a time or place where we didn't exist it would be an illusion. Once something exists, it always exists and all it can do is change form.

This principal is demonstrated on every electronic memory drive in the world because, the reason for why a file or a programme can never be truly deleted is because once it exists, all you can do is change its form. Even specialist wiping software that 'deletes' files beyond recovery merely changes the form of the file according to each utility's own algorithm. The more changes that can be applied to the file, combined with the ability to disguise the algorithm used to make these changes [so that it can not be reverse-engineered], the better the wiping utility. The developers of wiping utility software understand that once something exists, all you can do is change its form and so, this is how wiping utilities work.

It is also the reason for why we are running-out of space for landfill sites because, if it was possible to delete our waste instead of simply changing its form, we wouldn't need landfill sites.

Man has needs, not God and so it must have been man who created the rules along with the concept of 'sin' because it is men who say that God needs us to behave in certain ways and to believe in certain things. If God existed before everything and we have free will [as all of the religious books do state] then any rules can only have come from meddling and controlling men.

Are all 'sins' not simply threats to other humans? Even at that, most are only a threat to the male ego and not to human survival. God has no needs and has given us free will so how is it possible to disobey someone or something that has no needs, no vulnerabilities, and so no purpose for laws?

How and why God would desire that we question God

[If God is vulnerable to nothing then God can't be threatened by anything]

If a scripture is so 'right' that it is the only way to God and to Heaven, why would it be a sin simply to question it? How would simply doing this be a threat to a God who has no vulnerabilities? Wouldn't questioning it eventually bring you to arrive at it's truth [if it was true]?

If the teachings are so 'right' then surely God would want us to question so that we find God and our own ultimate truth? If you were telling the truth about something, would you want others to fear you or not to care to even question you, or to give you the benefit of the doubt? If you were telling the truth about something then wouldn't you want for this, or would you fear this?

Wouldn't God desire for us to know the truth of all things?

Why is it that in all of the books, that [as if by coincidence] the biggest punishments are reserved for those who question or change their beliefs? Who does it benefit if not God [God has no needs] that we all think in the same ways as each other and don't ever question what we are told?

If God is not affected by what you believe, then why would God care if these beliefs changed throughout your life? Isn't this growth? Is God now against growth even though growth and evolution is at the root of the entire nature and existence of God?

Do you really believe that God [the almighty] is so weak that God would be affected in any way by what any human believes, or by anything that happens on this planet or elsewhere?

If you do believe that God is affected by yours or anyone's beliefs, then you believe that God has needs and to believe that God has needs, you must believe that God is dependent upon something so as to exist and therefore, that God isn't the creator of everything, or as a member of a religion of lies and hypocrisy do you still want it both ways?

How and why it is okay by God, not to believe in God

[If God is vulnerable to nothing then God can't be threatened by anything]

Why would God care if we believed in God or not, when God has no needs and so is vulnerable to nothing? How does whether we believe on God or not affect God?

How did God survive in the time before humans, if God needs humans to believe in God? If God simply desires that we believe in 'him' then why would 'he' punish us for not doing so? Again, this would be a psychopathic 'God' who would choose to punish when there is no need.

There are people who don't believe in God yet who behave with more divinity than most priests, rabbis and imams. At the same time, the 'appointed' ones will judge the non-believer simply for being a non-believer. They will condemn or offer a prayer that the non-believer finds God [even though God has never left them]. The non-believer behaves like a saint without being motivated by the fear of God while the self-righteous break the laws of their own books by placing judgement and condemnation upon the non-believer, so what's all that about? It is very clear to me that the men of hypocrisy, self-righteousness, fear and control who invented the concept of sin are happy to break their own code when it suits them.

These religions actually make the Atheists seem like the only true men of God because Atheists act without fear or without the promise of reward and, without even believing in God in the first place. As far as we believe, animals do not follow a religious belief system yet they only take what they need [they optimise and never maximise] and never fight purely out of ego.

To summarise; leaving aside the issue of Atheists and non-religious believers of God voting in a theocracy [and of therefore empowering the church with the ability to dictate to them how to live], Atheists and animals behave more positively than most humans who believe in God do, yet it is the 'Godly' humans who judge, condemn and persecute the non-believers?

After thousands of years, the religions still can't decide if their God is a God of love or a tyrant of pain and so for religious doctrine to function, its followers must live in constant denial of God having no needs and all contradictions must be denied.

The religious justify wars in the name of God and peace while condemning others as not worthy of God simply because they don't believe in their God, meaning that the killers of 'God' are condemning others for not following their 'peaceful' faith!

There are people native to lands and cultures who have no knowledge of the Christian God [for example] so according to most religions these people will go to Hell because they don't believe in God. How is it that God would punish someone for not believing in God, when God would know that this person had no knowledge of God? What sort of a 'God' is this? Would this be a fair and just God? Would this be a loving, compassionate, all-knowing and forgiving God? Is this really the sort of 'God' who you want to waste your time with? Maybe these people already have an awareness of their own connection to a source or God? One thing is for sure, whatever they believe in or don't believe in, they are exercising their free will from God and they aren't trying to conquer, kill and control others as the Christian missionaries have done.

When the white missionaries came to Africa, they had the Bible and we had the land. They said, "Let us pray." We closed our eyes. When we opened them, we had the Bible and they had the land. [Desmond Tutu]

Give a man a fish and you'll feed him for a day. Give him religion and he'll starve to death while praying for a fish. [Timothy Jones]

The primary motive for the Christian and Catholic missionaries for infecting these cultures with their rule book from a God of free will lies in the fear and guilt associated with not obeying their God by not spreading 'his' message because, Jesus is the only way to God and to Heaven and their way is the only way of course!

Why would God actually even care if we worshipped God or not, when God has no needs?

Why waste time and energy spent in worship when it can be spent helping your fellow man and enjoying life? If you are so religious, why do you need to have rules forced upon you to make you take time-out to remember God? Do you forget God and not think of God at other times but feel you should? Is this how religious you are? If your praying and worshipping is a ritual demanded of you by your religion then what is it exactly that you think you are giving to God? How are you giving anything to God? Why do you think that God needs you to bow down before 'him' when we are all equal and are one with God and when God has no needs anyway? Do you think that God doesn't see through your nice clean Sunday suit or your washed hands to see any negativity that you have created during the previous week? Do you think that God even cares to judge? Why do you not realise that God is with you at all times and, if you do not question God then how do you expect any answers?

Following religious doctrine and codes of worship is done purely and only for yourself and not for God because God has no needs and so neither benefits nor suffers from what you believe or practice. Only you and those who mislead and oppress you benefit from this - not God.

There are people who go to church every Sunday or pray five times a day yet who behave like demons the rest of the time so, how do these people think that they can fool God when they can't even fool themselves?

Regarding food, Christians ask to be made grateful before meals and Muslims starve themselves during Ramadan so as to remember the hungry [as requested by Allah] yet generally give-up nothing to them - instead choosing to eat outside of daylight hours. Imagine how beneficial it would be if during Ramadan, Muslims sacrificed their food by actually giving it to the hungry outside of their religion! Seiks have no fasting period yet their temples will feed anyone of any faith or of no faith every day.

Wouldn't it be a dictator who would want us to worship it and would punish us if we didn't - especially when worship isn't needed? Wouldn't it be a dictator who would want us to fear and not to question? Wouldn't it be a dictator who gives us 'free will' and then punishes us when we use it? Wouldn't it be a dictator who gives us 'free will' and then manipulates our choice by attaching conditions and by using threats to influence our choice?

Is God forgiving and all-merciful and of love or is God a judgemental and vengeful bully and an entity of pain and suffering? How can the nature of God be both?

It can only be both through contradictory religious doctrine because again, the religions are used to having it both ways and out of habit, they do not expect to be questioned and in the UK and since 2012, it has been illegal to openly question or criticise religion [as this document does].

How and why God won't ever judge us

[If God has no purpose for laws then we have free will]

Why would God have asked of Abraham that he kill his son to prove that he loved God more than he did his son, when God would have had no need for Abraham to have loved God more than to love his own son in the first place? Is the religious God jealous and possessive like humans?

Does the almighty God have emotional needs and weaknesses and, a need for love to be quantified and returned? At most, wouldn't this just be a desire and not a need? If only a desire, then this is a twisted and jealous God that you waste your time and your life with and, it is a 'God' only of your own creation because your 'God' has failed to master a basic human emotion, where many humans have succeeded.

So again yet another contradiction; which 'messengers' were listening to the word of God? The ones who speak of God as being jealous, possessive, angry, vengeful, violent and condemning, or the ones who speak of God as being all-knowing, all-merciful, forever loving and all-forgiving?

If Abraham did actually have such an experience then what was he listening to when 'God' asked him to kill his son to prove his love, when a God who created everything has no needs and therefore can not be threatened by anything and so can never be jealous?

Has God really failed to master emotional jealousy where many humans have succeeded?

If Abraham did actually have such an experience, which God or what was he listening to when 'God' asked him to kill his son to prove his love for God, when God had given Abraham free will and has no needs? What God would put Abraham or any soul in this predicament for any reason? Is the religious God so insecure that 'he' has to test us with such brutality? Obviously!

The religions say that God knows of every human thought in every moment and then contradict this notion to create the myth of Abraham's experience so again, the religions want it both ways and in accordance with UK common law since 2012, we're not supposed to question these contradictions and we're instead supposed to just shut the fuck-up? Your choice, not mine!

Have you ever wondered why God would choose to talk with only a few select 'special' men when we are all equal, all human, and all from God? Why won't God talk with you? Do you really believe that there is something so special about these men [if they even existed] that we can only have a relationship with God through them and their [contradictory] words?

If you have bought into the notion that somehow these men are more intelligent or worthier or purer than you, why do you think that you need to be special simply to understand that God has no needs and so will always only ever love you regardless of what you do or don't do? If the word of God needs translating for the masses by a select few, then how can the information they give to us be for us? If it was for us then wouldn't we understand it through logic, intuition, and our innate wisdom? Why would it need translating? These men who put words in God's mouth are not translating - they are making ever-more complex the one true message [that God has no needs and has given free will] so that we empower their egos and protect them from having to face their own inner fears.

On June 8th the Pope gathered Palestinian and Israeli representatives in Rome to pray for peace - then there was war. How 'special' then is this man's connection to God?

Incidentally, it was the Catholic Church that took money from brutal Italian dictator Mussolini [in return for supporting and blessing his fascist government], and this capital has enabled it to invest in corruption to this day. It is one of the richest organisations on the planet and the Vatican is still exempt from any obligations of financial disclosure. The Catholic Church has so far invested with the Rothschild's banks, Hambros Bank, Credit Suisse, Zurich Bank, Morgan Bank, Chase-Manhattan Bank, First National Bank of New York, Bankers Trust Company to name a few and it has shares [currently worth more than \$500 M in the US alone] in corporations such as Gulf Oil, Shell, General Motors, Bethlehem Steel, General Electric, International Business Machines, TWA and others while its assets include a massive global property folio and the world's largest collection of art. It is the biggest wealth accumulator and property owner in existence and owns more material wealth than any other institution, corporation, bank, trust or government!

It also has a fund set-aside specifically for compensation pay-outs to victims of past abuse [which for decades it denied was happening while quietly transferring guilty priests to other diocese] and its previous leader was affiliated to Nazi groups in Germany - confirming the Catholic Church's support of undemocratic politics.

While you choose to give the power of your relationship with God to these manipulators, you compromise your freedom and become like sheep. No one can come between you and your freedom and your relationship with God unless you choose to let them so wake the fuck up!

God is talking with all of us all of the time, will always love us and always be with us. If you don't consciously ask God any questions, how do you expect to hear any answers? God is always connected to everything because God is everything, is in everything and, everything on this planet is God and is from God.

Not even your free will from God can disconnect you from God because you already exist - it is the nature of the connection. For God to disconnect from anything then God, you, or both, would have to cease to exist. However, it is not possible for anything that exists to cease to exist and it is only possible for things that already exist to change form - to evolve. You may delude yourself into thinking that God is not with you and so this is what you will experience but, it will not be a real disconnection and will be just another illusion that you ask to experience and will receive in-line with your free will.

If nothing is against God because God has no needs [regardless of the aspect of free will], then why would God have caused the great floods in Noah's time? Maybe we caused the floods in much the same way that we are doing now - with our negative thoughts and perceptions and by meddling with the natural environment? Maybe we have been here before? If this is true, who does it suit that you do not know this? If you think that God made mistakes [as apparently Noah thought], then how does a 'mistake' really exist when mistakes lead to failures and failures lead to success? If God made a mistake with the floods then God is being a learning vengeful emotional human God with needs but, this is not in alignment with the nature of a God who created all and who therefore has no needs.

If flooding the world was not a mistake, then it was done intentionally and if this was so and was done by God, then God contradicts giving us free will and having no needs and becomes a liar and a tyrant who didn't exist before everything [again] so, it can only be humans and/or natural phenomena that caused the floods.

Logically speaking, Noah's boat would have to have been large enough to hold

approximately ten million animals and, the Bible offers not a single explanation for how plants survived [being that Noah didn't take any plants on-board] and, being that it was a twig that Noah's bird brought back when it discovered dry land then this means that for some reason, the same God who warned Noah of the floods and advised him to build an ark, decided not to let him know how to find dry land. In my opinion, neither Noah nor Moses ever existed and both are entirely fictitious.

Whilst we believe in a dictator God with human traits of jealousy, vengeance, judgement and a place of Hell if we don't conform to God's will [instead of our own will], then we will not be open to questioning anything to do with reincarnation. If we don't question this, how can we learn from and correct any past mistakes that we may have created? We are responsible for our living conditions - not The 'Devil' or God. The 'Devil' is a man-made illusion [hiding our inner fear and guilt] and God has no needs.

While we believe in the Devil, evil, and a vengeful God of wrath, we can not unite as people and we will remain divided and controlled by twisted minorities because, our only true enemies will always only be that of our own fear and guilt and so it is these that we must address - not the 'Devil' or other 'evil' humans [an religious-influenced illusion].

If all of the peoples of all of the religions realised that their enemy was not the 'Devil' or each other, they would deal with their fears and guilt because this would be all that would be left to challenge. If there was no fear and guilt or hatred then what do you think would remain? Would we not just love each other? If we did this and all acknowledged that it would work if we didn't do to anything else alive anything that we wouldn't want done to ourselves then there would be no need for law or policing because laws would have no purpose. If we loved each other and shared more, the concept of ownership would disappear and we would take our status from something more worthwhile than material objects - like ourselves and each other! If we did this, currencies would also lose their value and purpose and we wouldn't have to work. If we didn't have to work we would spend our time being, exploring and expressing ourselves and if we did this, we would all be united in peace and love with God, outside of religions that lie to us about the nature of God and the existence of 'Hell' and the 'Devil'.

How and why propaganda from our 'leaders' causes Disunity

In February 2014, the Christian-oriented religious 'leaders' expressed their joint concern regarding the effects of the government's welfare reforms. They said that the policies were "*immoral*" and that they must be reviewed but, when the government was exposed in 2011 for running a shadow policy through the DWP [Department of Work and Pensions] to intentionally target and bully the most vulnerable claimants, not one clergyman at any level from any religion had a single word to say about the government's 'morals' and, the reason for their silence was simply because the people who were being targeted were such a small minority that they weren't worth crusading for.

The Eton and Cambridge-groomed head of the Church of England [Justin Welby] made hundreds of thousands of pounds working as an oil company executive for FTSE 100 group Enterprise Oil Plc [which exploits African mineral wealth] and, he is also a member of the Parliamentary Commission on Banking Standards. He strongly opposes homosexuality and is on record saying that he has "*neither the experience nor the desire*" to lead the Church of England [which is exactly what he is now doing] and so now instead says; "*I was unable to get away from a sense of God calling. I went kicking and screaming but I couldn't escape it.*" His place within the Parliamentary Commission on Banking Standards is further confirmation that the UK is still a theocracy and not a democracy [in any form].

With the Church of England also being a capital investor and beneficiary of Wonga [the high-interest loan company whose target market is the poorest of the poor], it leads the way in the morality stakes but, all of the religions have much to answer for regarding the issue of 'morality' and ethics.

Since 2010, the policies below have been implemented by the UK Parliament and in my opinion, they amount to nothing short of blatant and literal child abuse but, not one 'moral' religious 'leader' has ever said anything about a single one of these particular policies because, to succeed with their marketing plan they must choose to 'sell' their concern ONLY about issues that you know about or that directly affect you - en masse!

- Children's privacy [headline news outside EU and US]
- Children's legal rights to privacy - UK slammed by UNCRC
- Children open to abuses of privacy and dignity at school
- Spending for children's welfare slashed by 24% in Cameron's first budget
- UK funding forced sterilisation in India [headline news outside EU and US]
- Cameron's 'rebels' using fatwa to rape children [headline news outside EU and US]
- Policy that discriminates against the welfare of Muslim children
- Cameron ending funding for child rape victims [headline news outside EU and US]

Thankfully, Parliament and the religions continue to neglect the UK's army of one hundred and eighty thousand unsupported child carers [who don't vote and who are already conditioned to believe their parent's religion without question] and, the reason for why I am thankful is because judging by the policies above, any policy for dealing with this issue would probably be oriented around genocide at best - we are after all talking about the government that has repeatedly expressed its belief that only *some* children are talented [and therefore worthy of full support].

When circumstances dictate, the opportunist religions will choose to publicly distance themselves from Parliament's 'immoralities' in an effort to increase their ratings but, if Parliament ever votes to declare war [the most terrible and unethical of all human acts], they will immediately bless the government because of course, a creator God

who has no needs also happens to love violence and also likes to join-in and choose sides in human conflicts too! What an amazing coincidence that 'he' has always been on our side and so, as well as being pro-violence and discriminating, God is also a British nationalist who dabbles in international affairs - once apparently ordering a seriously deranged and religiously-deluded US president into war with Iraq and, being that Iraq is predominantly Islamic, we wonder what Allah would have to say about this other 'God' who apparently exists [even if only in the mind of George Bush]?

Up until the moment that Parliament actually votes to declare war, the same religious 'leaders' will publicly encourage the government to exhaust all possible diplomatic options and unfortunately [and due only to their deeply restricted and conservative thinking], Parliament and the religions believe that there is only a finite number of potential solutions for any problem and so, the resulting failure of any 'peace' talks will be a self-created insular 'reality' that they then place upon all of us because with our vote, this is what we ask for.

Culturally-inherent UK hypocrisy sees us teaching our children that violence solves nothing while sending our adults to fight in wars [that the 'peaceful' religions support by standing by our governments] simply because our so-called 'representatives' continually fail to address the fears of both themselves and of others and so fail to see that the true motives of our 'enemies' are only ever fear-based and instead, they see 'evil'. Self-righteous UK politicians then project this purely religious notion of 'evil' onto others making it their reality and based upon this false reality, they then start wars with our permission which we give them through our vote.

This process of projection is also exactly what happens when the religious believe that they are seeing the face of Jesus in a loaf of bread [for example]. The reason for why no Muslim has ever seen Mohammed in a potato is because Muslims believe in their minds that any depiction of their prophet is blasphemy - and so their minds will never perceive their prophet in any object because it is not possible for a potato to commit blasphemy. Instead, they see his name and, none of this is coincidental. Even children know that the objects that they 'see' in clouds are nothing more than projected imagination.

So, a God who has no needs and who loves us all also encourages us to kill each other while taking the side of humans over the side of other humans?

Whether we're conscious of it or not, mental projection happens to most of us to some extent throughout every day. It is influenced by internal factors such as thoughts, feelings, beliefs and memories of past experiences and it reshapes how we perceive things and situations externally and therefore, it also effects how we react to external events and triggers.

It is the reason for why the USS Vincennes shot an Iranian civilian air bus out of the sky in July 1988 - mistakenly perceiving it to be an Iranian fighter jet on an attack path towards it. Investigations have since shown that all of the ships instruments were working properly and did record and present all of the relevant events as they actually occurred and, that the defence radar system's operator's voice recording of what happened in that moment does not concur with what was being monitored, recorded and displayed by the system's instruments.

The instruments track two aircraft that take-off from two separate locations from within Iran at approximately the same time and both head-out across the Mediterranean Sea - one emitting a military transmission identifier code and the other [the airbus] emitting a civil code. For several days leading-up to the incident, the USS Vincennes had been provoking Iranian forces by sailing in and out of Iran's territorial waters which resulted in a skirmish with a small fleet of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard. These two factors would have been heavily on the mind of all on board and at

this level of intensity, it was highly likely that radar operators could project their fears onto the screens in front of them and inadvertently create a false reality [which the US military has now accepted as being key to what went wrong that day].

The investigation concludes by stating that one of the radar operators mis-identified both aircraft, while believing that the fighter was reducing altitude as part of an attack run as it travelled 'towards' the ship. On this basis, the wrong aircraft was targeted and hit and, the investigation also concludes that since take-off, neither aircraft reduced altitude at all and no instruments recorded or presented such information to any operator.

Incidentally, Iran's government publicly vowed to avenge the act but, the soon-after Lockerbie plane bombing in December 1988 was instead used as a political tool by the UK government in its oppression of Libya's regime and Gadaffi and, the provocative issue of the US war ship provoking the Iranian government by sailing in and out of Iranian waters for several days leading up to the incident has also been dismissed as irrelevant.

A far less-serious and much more common example of projection is when it comes to judging a glass of water as being either half-empty or half-full - with the latter said to be representing a positive outlook.

The illegal invasion and occupation of Iraq by Western forces in 2003 was based purely on personal projection and, it was also launched without any evidence to confirm if the projection was real to any degree or not. Tony Blair and George Bush decided that Iraq had acquired weapons of mass destruction [as we ourselves also have] and so, evidence supplied to politicians by the West's own intelligence agencies which contradicted this notion was oppressed, re-worded and 'sexed-up' simply because it didn't conform to Tony Blair's and George Bush's personal beliefs which pathetically - were all fear-based.

Two religiously-deluded, twisted and scared men launched an illegal war based ONLY upon their own negative religious-influenced projections, while ignoring the contradictory evidence supplied to them by their own agencies. Millions were killed or displaced and still, Tony Blair has never faced a single hearing at the International Criminal Court and still, voters refuse to punish the Labour party itself for such a disgusting and terrible act of irresponsibility. To this day and after knowing the truth [that Iraq had no weapons of mass destruction], the austerity-hit UK tax payer still funds all of Tony Blair's private security expenses while he makes millions - yet voters continue to vote for the party that created Labour's first overt Thatcherite.

Fundamentally, the Western lamestream media never reported about how Saddam Hussein stopped selling Iraqi oil in US Dollars [the world's reserve currency] prior to the invasion of Iraq in 2003.

In my opinion, the West's and NATO's most dangerous projection issue is that of perceiving Russia and China as threats. In response to its fears, NATO has for decades tried to gain influence and control in countries that surround Russia and China so as to deploy and maintain containment strategies - hence the West's intervention and removal of the former pro-Russian but majority-elected Ukrainian government.

Only Westerners who are asleep and still voting for so-called 'representation' would think that NATO is still concerned about defence. For the most part, NATO has been used as a battering ram to achieve regime change [an international crime] at the whims of propagandist Western politicians who refuse to enter into dialogue so as to achieve peaceful outcomes regarding issues of concern - because they wouldn't have a leg to stand on!

Unlike the UN [which remained neutral regarding the break-up of Yugoslavia], NATO

chose to take Kosovo's side when it wanted independence from Serbia in the early 90's and in doing so, it killed approximately five hundred Serbian civilians and took out the state TV station [a war crime] - killing more civilians.

This would be the equivalent to Russia invading and bombing Ukraine in defence of Crimea - which Russia has not done and to this day and despite Western lamestream 'news' telling us in words of Russia's invasion of Ukraine, not a single Western 'news' broadcaster has ever been able to show a single image of Russians in Ukraine or even Russia bombing it from the sky.

With regards to Western democracy hypocrisy; Kosovo didn't even hold a referendum on self-determination where Crimea at least did - yet this was 'illegal' according to Western 'leaders' because the Crimeans didn't get permission from the unelected armed minority coup attempt at a 'government' that the West illegally installed [thereby over-throwing a majority-elected, EU and UN-recognised government].

In its first session, the Kiev parliament voted to implement a raft of anti-cultural laws [such as banning the speaking of Russian], which it aimed at the Russian speaking and Russian-cultured population of East Ukraine where Crimea and other regions that want to escape persecution from the illegal Kiev 'government' are based. Even the Israelis had to have a word with 'our mate' Dave to ask him and Obama to rein-in their Nazi allies' militias!

Seems to me that a good way of avoiding being part of the hypocrisy would be to leave NATO immediately. Do we really want to be part of an agreement for which no country has ever been given a referendum on? In my opinion, it's simply not wise to commit UK forces to future wars regardless of the circumstances. To enter a war on behalf of another country regardless of the reasons as for why that country is itself at war is absolutely retarded and, when no referenda is ever given regarding going to war, it is also highly dangerous and completely undemocratic.

Blinded by its out-dated founding principal [all for one and one for all] NATO is open to being played by member states who wish to use it to suit their own domestic aims - such as the Turkish government does on a monthly basis regarding Syria when it stages false flag operations. Each attempt is the same; to outsiders, it appears that Turkey has been attacked by Syrian government forces but so far, the CIA has seen through it and so, NATO has not yet been ordered to attack Syria in 'defence' of Turkey but, David Cameron is looking for a way to reverse the vote that flattened his Blair Lie Template in 2013 and although he can legally [but completely undemocratically] go to war without a vote, to do so would be political suicide for his whole party as well as for him and as such, he would only make such a move if a Rothschild or Rockefeller ordered it.

If Ukraine ever becomes a member of NATO and, after all of the anti-Russian threats issued on a daily basis by the 'government' in Kiev [including threats of nuclear attacks on their own Russian-cultured Ukraine civilians which the BBC kept quiet about], any member of NATO will probably soon find itself at war alongside Ukraine and against Russia.

Want to be part of it? Keep voting and reap!

Another divisive point of Western democracy hypocrisy is with regards to the Arab so-called 'Spring'. The real Arab Spring, where oppressed populations over-throw Western-backed regimes and install their own idea of democracy [in countries such as Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Jordan and Bahrain] has yet to happen. It has not happened because these countries are the US and UK's biggest suppliers of oil and their biggest arms customers and, they also house bases for US and UK armed forces.

It is further testament to the truth that US and UK politicians can not solve even the

most basic problems, failing to see that the obvious solution for ALL parties would be to assist the people and these regimes to democratise in accordance with the people's own concept of democracy but, this hasn't even happened within the US and UK.

Not only that but, we now have a country that has installed its own corrupt democracy [it does not represent the majority and instead protects only the rich and the religious]. Its civil war gave rise to emergency laws that allowed the population to arm itself and even though the war is now over, many in the general population refuse to hand-in their weapons on the back of tribal-oriented threats to the government but unlike Libya, how many more school children will die on American soil before the US finally outlaws fire arms?

For any US government, choosing to rein-in weapons from its population would require as much courage as it would for a UK government to sell the benefits of domestic hemp cultivation to its population and on this basis, neither are likely to happen outside of direct democracy.

Another potential war-starting fear of the West is with regards to Iran's nuclear ambitions, where US fears become so real that they almost give Iran a reason to diversify its current programme of peaceful nuclear energy production to include weapons to defend itself from potential US fear-based aggression. The perceived 'need' for the West to have a gateway into Iran is the only reason for why Western governments have launched a proxy war [using Al'Qaeda & Co.] against Syria's President Assad.

Through Iraq, we experienced one of the most dangerous flaws in so-called 'representative' democracy [no war referendum ever being given to the people] along with the terrible consequences of acting upon a single man's negative fear-based, religiously-oriented projections and, as demonstrated by the refusal of voters to vote for direct democracy, we've not learned from this experience and so have changed nothing and so of course, if you continue to choose to vote for paranoid psychopaths then continue to expect more wars.

In 2012, MP Paul Flynn stood up in Parliament and spoke the truth of war and of history when calling to bring UK troops home from Afghanistan. He also referred to the front bench as donkeys and was banned from Parliament for five days. Are we really to believe that he was banned for causing offence? In my opinion, he was banned for speaking the truth.

Furthermore, Paul Flynn's constituents who put him in Parliament to represent them lost their voice. Our so-called 'democracy' punishes his voters by removing him from Parliament simply because he expressed both his and his constituent's sentiments and, because these were not in alignment with his or any party's policy towards Afghanistan.

A friend of mine served in the armed forces for his entire career and the last time we spoke he told me that war is a "*good*" way of getting others to do what you want them to do. It was something like; "*You just go over there, bash them on the head and job done!*" I said to him that I thought that was how a bully behaved - someone who restricted the rights of others, and he agreed! He didn't realise that he had 'justified' what the armed forces and the state would refer to as acts of terrorism - if committed by foreign civilians!

Another friend of mine [a tank battle group commander] returned from Tony Blair's illegal invasion of Iraq, telling me that he didn't understand why they were assisting one violent oppressive dictatorship [the US] over another [Iraq], and left the services. Another serving friend of mine [a tank gunner], went absent without leave during a break in his tour for exactly the same reason and despite the risks, he chose to go on

the run until eventually he was caught and then sent to military prison.

Who does it suit that we see each other as enemies? A God of peace? Who does it suit that we still choose to remain controlled? A God of freedom? Who does it suit that Christians are instructed not read the Qur'an based upon the propaganda that it is a book of demons, and so do not realise that to be a true Muslim is to promote peace before anything and to respect Jews, Christians and Muslims as one.

The notion that Mohammed was a paedophile is pure Christian demonisation and propaganda because according to the relevant derivatives of the Qur'an, Mohammed saw and identified that six year old Aisha would be his wife one day and, even though Mohammed would have been around forty two years old at this time, Mohammed expressed no sexual desires or sentiments towards her until she was an adult.

Aisha was seventeen when they married and she remained in the family home for three years with the marriage not being consummated until she was around twenty years old.

Paedophilia is a behaviour that revolves specifically around the belief that it is acceptable for adults to engage in sexual interactions with children. No aspect of this belief was ever demonstrated by Mohammed and so, regardless of how inappropriate, unusual, unreasonable or unjustified a forty two year old man identifying a future wife in a six year old girl may be, Mohammed was by clinical definition, never a paedophile.

It is unfortunate for Islam that some paedophiles who follow Islam also use this same propaganda so as to 'justify' having sexual interactions with children.

Who does it suit that Muslims are instructed to not even question their own book, even though the Qur'an clearly states that "*to Allah do all questions return*"?

Who does it suit that most Western-born Muslims of any culture learn the Qur'an in Arabic and not in a language of their own understanding? How is it possible for one to understand the book of Islam if it is being interpreted through the perceptions and interpretations of another and, when this is actually against the Qur'an?

The first instruction of the Qur'an is that to be a Muslim is to read the Qur'an to the best of their own abilities - not someone else's. It is very specific about this. Even if the Qur'an is being read in a language that is understood by the reader, to understand it to the best of his or her own abilities wouldn't this process then naturally involve a degree of questioning? On this basis, on what authority do the imams, spiritual 'leaders' and so-called 'scholars' tell fellow Muslims that it is a 'sin' to question Allah, the Qur'an, and the essence of the soul?

If Islam is the way of peace, why is it that in countries where Islam prevails and Sharia is the law [such as Saudi Arabia], do hard-line dictatorships not allow for democracy [in any form] and instead persecute the populous? Is this not Islam simply turning on itself? Is this the Islamic blueprint that the rest of the world and moderate Muslims will have to endure?

In many countries, the strategy of the radicals seems to be that at first, a small percentage of the population will be Muslim and it will be concentrated in particular locations. This percentage increases fast [as it is against Allah to use contraception] and as this judgemental population increases, Muslim-populated areas become no-go zones for others and then for the police. After this, Sharia law takes precedence over common law and this minority population will then call for Sharia law to be implemented nationally. This is rejected and as the Muslim population increases, regional and then national social coherence decreases. Governments and local councils then start to appease the Islamic hard-liners and to ignore the majority population and democratic processes and eventually, civil war and Islamic revolution

pursues. This results in the formation of a minority Islamic dictatorship that installs Sharia law nationally which then leads to the majority population and moderate Muslims being persecuted.

Examples of where this process is currently under-way in the UK can be found in London, Leeds, Bradford and in Birmingham's Alum Rock, Sparkhill and Balsall Heath areas where Islamic-owned shops display 'Sharia Compliant' signs and, Sharia law contradicts common law as well as much of the Qur'an, yet the state takes no action other than to appease it.

The Qur'an states to Muslims to respect the laws of other cultures and never to impose their own laws and, that Muslims living in other cultures must never attack their host country. It's a shame that moderate Islam within the UK continues to remain silent in its confusion, denial and fear - refusing to remind those who have lost their way of the teachings of their own book. How can they if they don't understand the Qur'an themselves?

Why are most Islamic nations dictatorships and not democracies [of any form]? Why do Islamic cultures still accept polygamous marriages for men only, rape, wife beating, the marrying of children and the public stoning and execution of women? Is this the summary of a guide for peaceful living or simply the control of whole populations by a minority of scared, twisted, and unquestioned men?

Why does the UK electorate continue to vote for governments that put oil before human and natural rights and that worship the brutal and psychopathic self-imposed dictators of Saudi Arabia [for example] and, why would any Muslim respect this regime when it has now edited the Qur'an to include statements about "*tanks, planes and bombs*"?

Who does it suit that Christians, Muslims and Jews do not question and so do not remember that the two sons of Abraham were the kings of the Jews and of the Muslims and therefore were one? If the Qur'an states that to be a Muslim is to re-cognise that Christians, Muslims and Jews are all one under God, why does this recognition not happen within modern Islamic societies when this happened within Mohammed's Medina and then later in Mecca?

Who benefits from the conflict that arose from the people being separated, divided and controlled and lacking in this knowledge, still continues today in Palestine and Israel - affecting the rest of the world?

Those who benefit are the politicians, pastors, priests, vicars, bishops, rabbis, self-appointed spiritual 'leaders', 'scholars', 'teachers', 'prophets', imams, clerics and the false psychics and mediums who will tell you that God intended for life to be hell and that this is why we cry when we are born. These people tell you what you have to do or should do or what you need instead of making you aware of your options. They will give you the impression that you only have one potential future and that they all know best because they are the 'experts' in matters of your life and God of course!

We do not benefit from any of this and neither does God. These 'leaders' continue to sell arms and oil and continue to keep people of the same faith [Christians, Muslims and Jews] at war with each other and they do it simply to satisfy their own fears. The self-deluded 'psychics' who are slaves to the desires of their weak ego's and who want you to see them as something special, will reduce your decision making abilities to the point where you can't make a single move without them.

These are the people who use the name of God to trick and scare us into war with each other and they scare us with God's wrath should we ever to dare question these things and, they will all tell us to fear God.

It is these people who have something to lose if we real-ised our freedom. They are

either under the illusion that God requires something from us and has needs [and therefore that we don't have free will – even though they will tell us that we do], or they are consciously using religion and the fear of their God's wrath to control us.

What 'God' was President Bush listening to when he told the world that 'God' told him to attack Iraq? Would a God who has no needs request that one human kill another whilst desiring that we all love each other? Why would Allah ask Mr Bush to attack any country [especially an Islamic country] when Islam means Peace? Was it not Mr Bush who wanted to launch a Crusade [again!] until his poodle-bitch Tony Blair calmed him down? Is God so weak and needy that God would request this of Mr Bush or of anyone?

If God really is this weak and vulnerable, then God can not be an all-powerful entity that existed before everything [as the religions say]. Again, the religions want it both ways and we are not supposed to question their contradictions?

These are the people who fear the truth about God and the Devil and Hell becoming real-ised - these and anyone who seeks to control others are the only people with something to lose and absolutely nothing to gain when you real-ise that God has no needs. This is not an attack, an accusation or a judgement - it is an observation. I have not stated whether I believe that in doing this, these people are good or bad, wrong or right etc.

However, the following is my opinion; they fear us having our own relationship with God without going through them. The truth is that without any knowledge from others, this relationship can be found and developed through your own innate intuition and wisdom alone. They fear that we would unite under a new truth and a new perception of God and of a non-existent Devil, evil and Hell. These people would lose their influence and control over us as we would then consciously fully exercise that free will that has been given to us from God and we would live in a true democracy where the people make all of the decisions. We would real-ise that the only enemies that we ever have are fear and guilt, and never each other.

What right does any man have to take away from another, that which God has given to us all? Only the 'right' you choose to give to them!

God has a desire that we love each other and not be under the illusion that we are separate and enemies but, it is not a need for God that we do this. It is us who need to love each other and we can start by acknowledging that our enemy is not each other or 'evil' but is instead only fear and guilt.

Whilst we choose to remain controlled by psychopathic religiously-deluded politicians, we are limited in our use of our freedom [we abuse it and so become power-less]. God gave us all free will [total freedom without conditions] so why would God want for people to be controlled by other people - therefore limiting the free will that God gave and in-turn restricting God's love?

Is God a liar? Would God say to one messenger that God is vengeful and yet say to another that God is forgiving? Again, who does it suit that we see each other as enemies? Who does it suit that we remain controlled?

It is no coincidence that if we faced our inner-fears and let go of guilt, we would find that we have no enemies and that there is no such thing as 'evil'. Who has anything to lose for us knowing the truth about God and the 'Devil' [the truth about our enemy within]?

Do you really think that God would fear us knowing this truth and becoming united in freedom? Do you really think that God would fear us knowing anything or, is it more likely that other humans would fear us having knowledge and freedom?

Maybe Jesus wasn't sent from God? Maybe Jesus himself requested his life path and purpose and maybe Jesus used his free will to choose to reincarnate [just as the same book that discounts reincarnation says that he will do again]? Maybe Jesus was no more or no less the son of God than any of us and maybe his life was a self-chosen demonstration of this?

Maybe Jesus was just as human as us and if so, his healing powers and compassion were a demonstration of how we could all heal each other and ourselves with energy manipulation, angelic assistance, and by conquering fear and guilt? Maybe Jesus is just another aspect of God [like us] coming to Earth in physical human form [like us] to experience human life in this way [like us] and to teach us of things human and Godly [including the so-called 'miracle' of healing] because Jesus had already acquired this insight? Whilst performing a healing, didn't Jesus say [according to the Bible] to the people present; *"This and more will you do"*? Do you think Jesus was talking about the washing up?

Who does it benefit that you do not know of your own innate God-given healing and intuitive abilities? Who does it suit that you believe that they are tools of the 'Devil' or, are for use only by 'special' people'?

Why is there no mention in the Bible of how at some stage of most crucifixions, the Romans would often administer a poison to finish-off the criminal because nailing people to a cross is a very slow death and often didn't even lead to death? Why is there no mention that an antidote to this poison was in the possession of the Christian underground? Did Mary and Mary Magdalene not recover the body of Christ themselves [as the Bible states] after the poison was administered? Is it not therefore possible that Jesus and others survived crucifixion by ingesting this antidote?

The Bible states that others saw Jesus after the 'resurrection' so, wasn't he still alive? What would this mean if Jesus lived longer than the Bible has told us? If the Bible is the truth, then where is the threat in anyone questioning it? If Jesus did survive the crucifixion and was with Mary Magdalene [his wife?], then doesn't this raise the possibility that they may have had children? If this was so then couldn't there be direct bloodline descendants of Jesus living on Earth today?

Christian history shows that the Bible is a compilation of edits taken from eighty seven different books. One of these was written by Mary Magdalene [who spent more time with Jesus than anyone else] and no aspects of her book were included in the compilation [edited by men]. Science has not found one artefact from over half a million people spending any time in the desert – never mind for forty years and, Judaism still ignores the science that shows that the world has existed for longer than six thousand years.

Another point of Christian propaganda [aimed at Rastafarianism] is when Christians depict Jesus as being white. The Bible itself describes Jesus very definitively as a black/Arabic man and, as Adam and Eve were supposedly the first humans on Earth [and therefore must have come from Africa], they clearly must also have been black too. Didn't the origins of Human life begin in Africa? Wasn't Africa the first landmass before splitting into three and then into more?

Just imagine what would happen if this was true and if this truth became known. Who would have something to lose, something to fear and nothing to gain? Would this also not explain the 'chip on the shoulder' that white cultures patronise the black cultures with? All this when it was actually the white cultures who chipped the shoulder of the black man by oppressing the Rastafarian faith with biblical propaganda and by enslaving their cultures, stealing their lands and by restricting their free will.

If Jesus, Adam and Eve were black and the predominantly white religions could accept

this by dealing with its fear of this, then this could lay the roots for the end to the oppression of the black cultures. If the enslaving nations could apologise for their past behaviour, the cost of legal compensation payments to descendant families would be far less than the costs to all in the continued oppression of the black cultures and the continued denial that Jesus may have been African or Arabic. The individual and social healing benefits to all cultures would be immense and could potentially enable enhanced cross-social and cross-culture cohesion and along with the black cultures, we would all benefit from this and, in many ways.

The power of resistance always eventually equates to the power of oppression [it's basis physics], so this will happen one day anyway so why not do it now and with responsibility. Like any maintenance job, the longer an issue is neglected, the more damage will occur and the higher the cost will be when eventual rectified.

For the same reasons, if the Christian faith could apologise to the Islamic faith for launching the initial crusades into Muslim lands then again, we would all benefit.

Who does it benefit that you think that divine information can only come to you through another human or 'expert' in the field or, from in a book written by other men and not through your own questioning?

Who does it benefit that you don't question information that you read in the books or don't question information from someone more 'qualified'?

Who does it benefit that you believe that you can only have a connection and relationship with God through them and their books? Are you starting to see the same people when you ask these questions?

God has no needs and so we have free will.

How and why violence solves nothing

Revolution is the result of oppressed evolution expressing itself and this often involves violence but, true and efficient evolution has no use for violence. Revolutions are won by those who use the most force because in a revolution, there is no majority election. Evolution involves people actually choosing to advance their systems and so self-rule and direct democracy can only come through evolution.

From a moral perspective, the use of violence is generally considered to be 'wrong' but within the same circumstances, the use of violence can also be considered by others to be 'right'. This difference in opinion alone has the potential to cause conflict when attempting to create all-inclusive sustainable solutions for conflicts because 'wrong' and 'right' are simply varying opinions - not facts.

From a logical perspective, the use of violence is not seen as wrong nor right but it is instead seen in terms of costs and benefits;

The benefit to the party administering the violence is that this party is able to modify the behaviour of another against their will, to suit themselves.

The cost to the party administering the violence is that the behaviour of the other is only altered whilst the violence is being administered. In some form and at some point in time, the modified behaviour will revert because the use of violence does not change people's minds, hearts and attitudes and instead, it only changes their behaviour in the short-term and this is due purely to the survivalist nature of all humans.

As an additional cost, the administrator of the violence may come to experience forms of resistance and then even revenge. Some label this resistance as 'terrorism' and some label it as 'freedom fighting' - both opinions, not facts.

It is the nature of human beings to make our own choices [to be free]. Therefore, self-rule is in our nature. Physicians, politicians and military planners now accept that in any circumstances, the power of resistance always eventually equals the power of oppression so eventually, our so-called 'democracies' will evolve from partisan-based to people-based and, direct democracy will be the new culture of politics.

I believe when Jesus was talking of why there is no point in the use of violence, that he wasn't speaking morally [as the Bible indicates] or even ethically, but was speaking logically.

Why there won't be a Second Coming

[If God has no purpose for laws then we have free will]

All religions state that we have free will, yet the contradictory notion of a Second Coming has encouraged complacency and irresponsibility within the religious because believing that a third party will sort everything means that the world's fundamental problems don't get addressed by us. If God ever chose to interfere in such a way, then God would know that this interference would prevent us from learning and from growing and so in the long run, such interference would be rendered useless.

This is the reason for why God does not interfere in our free will – there is no ultimate purpose. For better or for worse, the world is the way that it is because of the decisions that we all make in every moment and so from God's perspective, there is nothing to correct because we are all getting what we have chosen.

Sustainable solutions for problems within human cultures can only come from humans themselves because it is humans who have created these problems and, with our own free will. Solutions handed to us from any third party will at best, only be short-term solutions.

What sort of free will says *"I'll give you the planet and each other to look after and to love but when you make the 'wrong' choices and fuck it up I'll step in and sort it out myself [so you don't learn and evolve] and then give it back to you to do it all over again because you wouldn't have learned anything about where you went off-course"?*

Why would God override our free will and send someone or something to deal with the results of our own freely-made choices when God has no needs? I reiterate; the state of the world and of life on Earth is a direct result of us exercising our free will in every moment of our lives and this means that we have therefore chosen that the world will be the way that it is. Why would a God who has no needs not let us have what we have chosen – however dire?

All religions state that we have free will while stating that if we use it in a way that displeases God, we will be punished by God. This is conditional 'freedom' [which doesn't exist] and so is therefore not free at all.

All religions state that we have free will while stating that everything happens in accordance with God's will, and so those who believe the latter part of this contradiction don't take responsibility.

Those of no religion who believe that we can't change the world simply fail to see how the actions of every human in every moment has always been shaping the world, and so they also don't take responsibility.

Jesus gave us insight into what could occur if we made certain choices but, Jesus didn't tell us which choices to make and the reason for this is because God has given us free will and Jesus knew and understood this.

Freedom with conditions is not freedom. We have free will [the ability to make choices]. Whether you believe in God or not, you spend every moment of your life experiencing the use of this free will. We are so conditioned that we find it difficult to see and accept that we all already have total and complete freedom [the ability to make choices] and that this means living without any rules from anywhere - especially from a God who existed before everything and who therefore has no needs or vulnerabilities and so no use for laws. We already have this freedom but we don't realise it and so we don't use it to its fullest potential [we abuse it]. At the same time,

those who fear us using it try to use the 'fear' of God to stop us seeing that we do actually have free will and, that God has no needs.

Maybe a Second Coming would take a different form to that of the religious idea? Maybe Jesus and others would choose and agree that Jesus would reincarnate into the bodies or consciousness of many instead of just one? look what happened last time! It could just be that part of any Second Coming involves us all choosing to evolve by questioning the things that others have conditioned us with, eventually evolving to a state where we are all more like Jesus ourselves?

Ultimately, the complacent behaviour that is influenced by the belief in Christ's return actually increases the rate of the planet's environmental damage because, while the religious believe that God [through Jesus] will come and 'correct' the results of the freely-made choices of all humans, they [as the global majority] fail to take responsibility for the world's ills themselves and, being that Jesus isn't likely to interfere in the results of our free will even if he did return, wouldn't it be more prudent to step-up to the job ourselves and, before it's too late?

Being like Jesus isn't about being perfect because if perfection is completeness and if we ever reached it, then the journey would end - along with our reason for existing. The journey would stop because you would have no more growing or evolving to do but the thing is, upon realising that you were complete and that you had no more growing to do, you would have changed and evolved just for having the additional knowledge of who you now are in that moment and so you would then have more of yourself to experience and express [you would have evolved].

Imagine it as an evolutionary 'feedback loop' where each time you get to see who you fully are, you evolve into the new you simply for having seen who you fully are [or by this stage - who you were]. It is this loop that keeps all of life circular [hence reincarnation] and this is why all life would cease if the loop ended and, it is also why aiming for perfection is viable while aiming to become perfection itself is not.

Why would this be any different for Jesus who was, like us, as much human as he was God? If Jesus is the son of God then aren't we all the imperfect sons and daughters of God?

Why would this be any different for God even? If God was ever to reach a state of perfection then God would no longer be able to evolve and so would instead stagnate because, the constant driver and purpose of an evolving life is to chase perfection without ever reaching it.

If anything is alive then it is on it's journey and it will always exist in one form or another and will always be evolving so will always be asking; *"What am I?"* Jesus was alive so therefore wasn't perfect and reaching perfection [ending the journey] wasn't his purpose because even if it was possible or purposeful to reach perfection [the end], it would just be a new beginning [because of the evolutionary feedback loop] where there is no end and life is circular, ensuring continuation. The question *"What am I?"* will always be relevant for every aspect of God and life.

There is no after-life because death itself is part of life. It is a mechanical process and it never goes 'wrong' and so, there are no 'lost' souls and only bits of discarnate emotional energy that the religious and others mistake for 'ghosts'.

Why would God need for us to be perfect or not to make what we call 'mistakes'? Why would God put us in Hell for making mistakes when making mistakes is part of an on-going learning process? Don't mistakes lead to failures and don't failures eventually lead to successes?

The predominantly Christian West says Grace at the table before eating, thanking the lord for what they are about to receive, yet it is the Christian West that holds 80% of

the world's wealth leaving the remaining 80% to survive on what's left. It is the Christian West that dies from obesity-related diseases while their freely-elected 'leaders' cause the deaths of up to four thousand children a day through lack of drinking water alone, and thousands more due to starvation.

It is Western Jewish and Christian-owned companies [such as Monsanto] that lie about genetically modified food being the solution for the world's starving, while actually increasing starvation in countries where its toxic crops are grown.

People die from starvation due to greed, poor food distribution and wrecked environments, not lack of food!

It is Western Jewish and Christian-owned companies [such as Monsanto] that are protected by the freely-elected 'leaders' from having their products tested before going to market. It is Monsanto that the freely-elected 'leaders' allow to patent aspects of nature [as if Monsanto itself created them], ensuring that no one can benefit unless Monsanto gets paid. Similar Western bio-research companies are now also fighting for the 'right' to patent human DNA, ensuring that cancer sufferers [for example] do not get cured unless these companies get paid - even if they have no direct hand in the sufferers recovery.

It's interesting how Christians actually ask the lord to "*Make us truly grateful*" during Grace, as if to acknowledge that they are not already grateful?

The state of the world and of life on Earth is a direct result of us exercising our free will in every moment of our lives and this means that we have therefore chosen that the world will be the way that it is.

Why God won't ever punish us

*[If God can't be threatened by anything then God has no purpose for laws
If God has no purpose for laws then we have free will
If we have free will then there is no punishment]*

If we are God [the part that chose to experience human physicality] and God is us, why would God punish Godself for anything? If God was to punish Godself, then doesn't it follow that God would have a reason to punish Godself? If God had a reason to punish, does it not follow that God would understand the reason? If so, then where is the purpose in God punishing Godself? What would God gain or achieve that God had not already achieved from knowing of the reason beforehand?

On this very same basis, why would God punish anyone for anything? If God has no needs then God has no vulnerabilities and so can't be threatened and so has no use for laws.

God [as with angels], can only be concerned with the essence of our souls - not our behaviour. Men are concerned with our behaviour and our behaviour does not always reflect our true intentions [because we are evolving humans - not because we are 'evil'] and so quite often when we hurt another [for example], it is not intended and if not intended then it was a mistake and so what is there to punish? Where is the 'evil'?

All mistakes are part of a larger learning process so therefore, they are often a necessary learning experience that enables humans to evolve. The more mistakes we make, the more we eventually learn. Regardless of intentions, some people are incapable [through no fault of their own] of expressing something without hurting others but, this doesn't mean that they intend to cause pain or that they are 'evil' [an illusion]. If such a person feels guilt and regret then what would be achieved in punishing this person? Does God cause and administer pain simply out of desire? Is this the 'God' you choose to worship? If so, what does this say about you?

Why would God need to create a 'Hell' to put souls into when God has no needs, has given us free will, and loves us all while understanding that all 'evil' comes only from pain and suffering? If humans understand this then surely it goes without saying that God does? It is a human [not a God] that would feel the need or the desire for revenge, retribution and punishment and, isn't it more likely that the all-powerful, all-knowing God would instead educate and heal [love]?

If neither God nor humans benefit from God dishing-out punishment to us [for any reason], then does God punish just for fun then? Does God get a kick out of punishing others? Does this make God happy? If this is the case then again, what sort of a 'God' is this that you freely choose to worship? Seems like Satan to me because, isn't it a Devil who would benefit from punishing and inflicting pain?

All religions state that non-believers [for example] will be punished by God and if this is true, then God does this purely out of desire [it is clearly not a need] and so isn't this 'God' actually a tyrant? Isn't this supposed to be the nature of the 'Devil'? This is obviously not a God of strength, peace and love.

When a human inflicts pain on others purely out of personal desire, we label them psychopathic. Even if not psychopathic, such a God would have less compassion than most humans because most humans only punish their children because they believe that they need to - not because they desire to.

Furthermore, God will still exist even if no humans believed in 'his' existence because

God existed before 'he' even created humans and so humans holding this belief is not a need for God. If it is a desire then again, this God is a tyrant.

We all have a conscience and a level of self-awareness regardless of our beliefs. We are all born with wisdom [connection to intuitive and divine knowledge] and we all have [to some extent] our own opinions of wrong and right, good and bad, positive and negative etc. Whilst we are all individuals we are also all human and all living upon the same planet so we do have fundamental commonalities and our fundamental needs will therefore be the same. Most of us have the ability to learn from mistakes and to feel remorse and regret and most of us also have the ability to change at any time - if we so choose.

If you have hurt another at some point, you may come to regret it. You will do this because you believe in your heart that what you did was 'wrong' and you will know it is wrong because it is something that you would not have done to yourself. You can spend your life in denial but your conscience will not let you forget and you can not escape from the truth of what you know yourself to be, or to have thought, said, or done. You can not escape the knowledge that in your own opinion, that you made a mistake and that you have regrets.

I believe that the one thing that we all take with us when we die is the truth – the truth of our entire lives.

For most people who are uncomfortable with something that is guilt-related, they will sometimes be afraid of their own company because when they are alone, they are with their own thoughts and their own conscience. It is when in this isolation and self-condemning state that we can feel that we are worthy of nothing more than the guilt and pain that we endure and, we then use it to punish ourselves. We start to create our 'Hell' while alive on Earth and when we do this there is more chance that we will repeat the same act that made us feel guilty in the first place because we will eventually tell ourselves that we are not deserving of being free from the guilt. We will tell ourselves that the only thing that we are deserving of is more pain but, self-harm of any nature [particularly through harnessing and empowering guilt] causes more pain to others too.

This may be main reason for why forgiveness of others is important - so that we can more readily forgive ourselves [if possible]? When we forgive others and ourselves we in-turn reduce the chances of dis-ease occurring within ourselves and so other than as a wake-up call and behavioural modifier, guilt promotes only negative actions for all to endure – not just for the beholder.

If this process can happen through our own choosing when we are alive and, if part of the process of death involves being alone or alone with God, then couldn't this also happen in death? If in death we are at some point only in the presence of our truth and we see our actions and ourselves from a different perspective, then maybe it is only us who judge ourselves as worthy of either Heaven or 'Hell'?

God has no needs so why would God judge?

Why would God interfere in our freely-willed judgements of ourselves? Wouldn't God give us whatever it is we feel we are deserving of? Wouldn't a true creator God of love and freedom give us what we want? It is only us who judge ourselves and put ourselves into Heaven or 'Hell'.

It just may be that no one is innocent and that no one is guilty [there are no rules or sins with free will and so 'wrong' and 'right' are just personal opinions]. There may be no such thing as villains or victims [it could be only our Earth-bound perception that leads us to believe in the concept of justice and the need for it]. Quite often, when a person is doing something against another, they may just be doing something

intended for themselves; the woman had an affair because she wanted to feel something just for herself and her own benefit - not to hurt her husband. The husband feeling hurt is an emotional consequence that is a separate event to that of the woman having the affair. Even if someone is consciously hurting you in order to benefit themselves in some way or to satisfy their own fear or guilt, you still have options in how you deal with it and from this, it can be possible to convert your own pain into something positive and even of purpose - as many often do.

Everything that we do is actually for ourselves anyway because even a selfless act for another has its benefits and pay-backs because when we do something 'purely' for the benefit of another [and even at our own expense or risk], we at least have the knowledge that we have done such a thing and this knowledge alone gives us something that is positive and benefits us and so, nothing is ever done purely out of selflessness.

How and why there is no Hell

[If there is no punishment then there is no Hell]

If the nature of a non-punishing and non-judgemental God would not call for the creation and existence of a post-death 'Hell', that then only leaves that this concept is metaphoric - that we ourselves create a heaven or hell that we then experience in accordance with our own free will [basically; that we have yet again been lied to by the religions].

Hell would be our very own custom-built environment based upon our own design and the features that form this virtual environment would become defined during the design process [our time spent within any level of post-death truth-consciousness] as we judge and condemn ourselves to being worthy only of deserving such a hell.

For Hell to exist, Hell would have to have purpose because all that exists, exists for a reason [to fulfil a purpose]. For Hell to be purposeful, something must be achieved whilst in Hell and if while we are in our hell, we experienced that all we would be doing is sitting in our own guilt and that God had 'forgiven' us and loves us and wishes only for us to continue to grow and evolve through joy [not pain] and, if we saw no purpose in our hell because we weren't changing or growing, wouldn't we then choose to end the illusion and to go forward with a renewed perception?

Going forward would be to go to our own heaven with God [back to source] and as with our own hell, Heaven would also be virtual/self-created and - in accordance with our own free will.

From another angle, If God has no need to punish us and, if we see that we have learned and have developed, what would any punishment actually achieve other than the creation of more pain? What then would be the purpose of any punishment? If spent time in Hell as punishment wouldn't change anything that arose from any negative behaviour that deserved Hell and, if it wouldn't change you because you've already changed, then where is the sense or purpose in punishment in Hell? It would have no benefit and would only achieve the creation of more pain and, God would know that hurt souls go on to hurt other souls.

There are still tribes who as punishment for members who commit crimes, spend entire days doing nothing other than reminding the perpetrator of how good they are and of all of the good things that they have achieved in their life - while our religious and political 'leaders' condition us with notions of punishment along with the bullshit that modern civilisations have advanced when really, they have regressed.

If in 5BC, the Greeks voted upon ALL issues [even without the web and phone] and NEVER voted for so-called 'representatives', then democracy has regressed and so, any cultures that use 'representative' democracy have actually regressed too.

The only thing that punishment in Hell would serve would be a vengeful God who has human-oriented needs and vulnerabilities. This surely isn't our all-merciful, all-forgiving and all-powerful God who loves us all is it? This isn't the same God who gave us freedom is it? One thing's for sure - join the religious and you can have it both ways [along with every other contradictory aspect].

All humans are capable of exercising, expressing or repressing the same range of character traits as each other and, we can judge someone as being nasty [for example] when they may generally be an angel and we've just caught them at a bad time. Just because someone is behaving nastily, it doesn't necessarily mean that they

ARE nasty.

People's character traits are like the bands of a graphic equaliser on a hi-fi amplifier. We can express [increase] some frequencies [traits] and repress [reduce] some frequencies by how high or low we set the bands and, we experience, adjust and re-balance them as we grow and develop [hopefully].

You as the music, have many characteristics [instruments]. You may not be playing a particular instrument loudly all of the time but you still play it so if you're missing some positive parts of your 'old self' then just re-member that those characteristics are still part of you and are just waiting to be rediscovered – when you will it so. If you wish to aspire to characteristics that you think you don't that yet have, then know that they are already within you and that you just have to believe and be-come.

For example; if others have told you that you that you are *"not a friendly person"* and you now also think that you're not a friendly person but would like to become a more-friendly person, just re-member that before being hurt or scared, that you always had it in you to be a friendly person. Imagine being with courage and just go and be. Imagine yourself smiling at strangers as you walk past and just go and be - by doing what you imagine.

If others have told you that you that *"you are a weak person"* and you now also think that you're a weak person but would like to become a stronger person, just re-member that you always had it in you to be a strong person. Imagine being with strength and just go and do it. Imagine yourself standing up to those who you feel oppress you and just go and be - by doing what you imagine.

If others have told you that you that *"you are not confident"* and you now also think that you're not a confident person but would like to become a more confident person, just re-member that you always had it in you to be a confident person. Imagine being with confidence and just go and do it.

Imagine yourself speaking louder next time you order a drink at a bar and just go and be - by doing what you imagine. Fake it if you need to! If you can do it, pretending to be more confident than you actually are can get others to treat you accordingly and this in-turn can encourage the development of your own true confidence.

Have some fun! View your first attempts at any changes as practice runs. When things backfire, view that this can only happen because you are going forward - you are evolving. If you weren't going forward then you would be stagnant and in the same place and there would be nothing to challenge. Stepping backwards to take a different root forwards is not stepping backwards and is instead part of the process of change where you are redirecting your personality traits so as to be more of what you actually want to be.

It is not just the right of celebrities to reinvent themselves!

Turning down the bass means that you will hear less volume on the lower frequency [bass] instruments. They do not completely disappear though and you can still hear them faintly. In the context of relationships [of any nature], because we all carry the potential to exercise the same characteristics, we are all therefore as compatible or incompatible with each other as we choose to be.

Within intimate personal relationships, the truth is that anyone is compatible with anyone - depending on where the 'bass' and 'treble' are set. If you choose to compromise your current personality to become more compatible with someone, then it is your choice to do so but re-member that it is your choice to do so and re-member that even though the effect will be beneficial to all, ultimately you change yourself for yourself and for the associated benefits to you.

Even if you are deluding yourself that you are changing for another, re-member that you are doing it because you have seen benefits to yourself in doing so - regardless of whether it also suits another. Ultimately and regardless of any influence, only you can choose to do this.

Maybe across multiple incarnations, we all at some point express and repress the full range of possible characteristics that make us all who and what we are? If this is so, then this means that there is even less validation or purpose in punishment because it means that at some point, we've all been or will be as hurtful and as loving as each other.

If punishing you for anything has no purpose because you have learned and evolved and you acknowledge the effects of your actions against another, how would it be just and who would it serve that others are punished for their mistakes against you? If you want 'justice' for when someone hurt you, then shouldn't you also expect the same from someone that you hurt? If you did, what would be the point if you had both regretted and learned? The only thing that would be achieved would be the creation of more pain because no additional learning or development could ever come from this.

According to the Bible itself, didn't Jesus once say to the hypocrites something like *"Let he who lives without sin cast the first stone"*?

If we can have this understanding from a human perspective, wouldn't God also have at least this perspective? Isn't God more intelligent than us? Isn't God the ultimate intelligence?

Furthermore, for Hell to exist, God must also be in league with the Devil because, if God decides who gains entry into Heaven or Hell and the Devil accepts God's rejects into his realm, then this is a mutual agreement in action because both entities are in control of their own domain.

To summarise; if you believe in a Hell where God places condemned souls, you must also accept that God and the 'Devil' are working together as an alliance and, that God has only a desire to do this – not a need.

How and why God does not test us with pain and suffering

[If we have free will then there is no punishment]

If God has no needs and, if God sees no benefit from the punishment of any party and, if God does not desire to punish and, if there are no rules to break anyway, why would God be responsible for anything that causes us pain or suffering and, why would God choose to test us? What exactly is it that God would be testing us for when God has no needs and no vulnerabilities and so no purpose for laws that one would need to be tested against in the first place?

When we lose a child to hunger or our house to an earthquake, why is this of God's desire? If God has given us free will and has no needs and is not dependent upon the thoughts and behaviour of humans, where is the logic or love in God deciding when our loved ones will starve or when the ground will crack-up? Maybe these things happen for other reasons and maybe we are more responsible for these reasons than we care just to question, never mind accept?

Religion keeps us blind to the real reasons for our suffering and therefore, incapable of accepting responsibility. If we don't take responsibility then nothing will change and the world and its population will continue to suffer and we will continue to blame God until it wipes us all out.

For example; whilst we blame God for a lack of rain for our crops or for flooding, we can't address the real problem - our abuse of the atmosphere through pollution. Whilst we blame God for ALL earthquakes, we can't address the real problem for most of them - our abuse of the environment by extracting oil [in my belief], and by fracking.

Nothing can bring-about the extinction of human cultures faster than believing that a creator God who has no needs, also causes disease and environmental catastrophe as punishment because, while the majority of people on this planet blame these things on God and 'sinners', they don't take responsibility for the actions that they themselves commit that are actually the cause for such destruction. Combine this with an attitude of having superiority over animals, plants, and other humans [as all religions do] and, then consider the Catholic and Islamic policy of infinite breeding [which is always successfully passed-off by deceitful right-wing and nationalist politicians as an 'immigration' issue], and you will see how and why the religious themselves are proliferating the destruction of God's gift to us and, it is not a coincidence that disease and environmental catastrophe will extinguish humans first - leaving the rest of nature to survive and restore itself after clearing the planet of selfish, self-righteous humans who treat this planet mostly as a testing ground for entry into Heaven.

In addition to this hyper-judgemental attitude, the complacent behaviour that is influenced by the belief in Christ's return further increases the rate of damage because, while the religious believe that God [through Jesus] will come and 'correct' the results of the freely-made choices of all humans, they [as the global majority] fail to take responsibility for the world's ills themselves and, being that Jesus isn't likely to interfere in the results of our free will even if he did return, wouldn't it be more prudent to step-up to the job ourselves and, before it's too late?

Environmental catastrophe does not happen due to bad luck either because everything happens for a reason [cause and effect] meaning that there is no such thing as luck and regarding luck, I have never met one person who believes in luck

and who has his or her own theory or explanation for how it works. At most, I've had "*God makes luck happen.*" [good and bad] so here we go again with the 'God' who didn't give us free will and who instead has the need to judge and condemn and cause suffering [just as a slowly-evolving vengeful human would].

It has always meant something to me that people who believe in luck can't explain it while at the same time, people who can explain how everything happens for a reason [through cause and effect], seem to take more responsibility for the things that happen in their lives and seem to lead more productive lives.

It's simple; if the smoke from your cigarette that blew into your eyes was bad luck, then is the contribution from the wind, its direction, your positioning and timing all irrelevant factors?

If you look with a technical perspective into any event that you think involved luck [good or bad], you will start to see reasons at the root of the occurrence of the event [look with your mind and not with your eyes]. If you look into any event that you think involved 'evil', you will start to see things born only of fear and guilt at the root of the motives and occurrence of the 'evil' event.

One of the times that I ended up homeless was because of how a relationship with a girl friend of mine broke down - not because of bad luck and not because of God. How things fell apart and for me led to homelessness, was partly my responsibility and partly someone else's responsibility and nothing to do with luck or with God. There were reasons that were directly within my control and within the control of another and these alone were the reasons for how and why I became homeless.

At the time, I believed that God would not want me to suffer but I knew from experience that God had given me the will to make my own choices and to let me learn and develop from the results of them. None of this happened due to God or luck and everything happened for a reason.

Now, what about if everything that happens is actually always positive? What if things that happen only seem 'good' or 'bad' from a certain perspective or from a certain time? What if it is just difficult to see the positive reasons for why 'bad' things happen when we are suffering? Just because we can't see something it doesn't mean that something doesn't exist [as with electricity].

Which 'messenger' was listening to the word of God? The one who says that God will interfere and test us with pain and suffering [somehow out of love], or the one who says that God only wishes for us to be happy and to enjoy life because God loves us and whilst God is being us, God would rather have some fun - not misery?

When we are working hard at something, are we not working inefficiently? If we were being more efficient and more focused, wouldn't we achieve more? Could we even achieve more in less time? Why is it that the UK has the longest working hours in Europe with ever more present half-hour lunch breaks, yet is the least productive country in Europe? Why are we so Hell-bent on our work 'ethic' when it doesn't even work? Admitting to ourselves that there may be a better way or a better truth is not the same as admitting that we were 'wrong'. It is a way of adapting what we know by evolving through education and if we don't believe in this, why are we bothering to send our children to school?

The UK Conservative Party's anti-welfare propaganda campaign includes the message; "*On the side of hard-working people.*" and not; "*On the side of focused and determined people.*" and their choice of slogan is highly representative of their thinking about this.

If you're thinking of tough love, then re-member that hitting a child for doing 'wrong' only teaches that child to hit others if others also do 'wrong'. It teaches that it is okay

to use violence to get your way and this leads to us thinking that it could be 'right' to go to war or kill another and - that God is on our side.

How and why the books contradict the nature of God

[If - as the religions state, God existed before everything, then God has no needs]

All of the books of the religions all claim to be the word of God but, written to the pages by men. Is it not possible that any of these male human 'messengers' who were listening to the word of [their] God, may have [inadvertently] projected some of their own male human fears and guilt into their own thoughts of what they thought God wants and 'needs' of us?

Is it not possible that when the 'messengers' contradict themselves and each other in their writings about the same God, that they may have simply been listening mostly to their own thoughts and feelings or, even listening to meddling entities or discarnate human thought or personality energy of the living as well as the dead?

How can we believe beyond uncertainty, that Mohammed wasn't taking doctrine from one of these lost fragments pretending [or even believing itself] to be the angel Gabriel? How would Mohammed himself have known even? It was Mohammed's wife who interpreted his experience in the cave for him and it was her who told him that the source of his 'divine' doctrine was the angel Gabriel - and she wasn't even with him at the time! After all, the books of all religions do state that God has needs and requirements of us, and this contradiction with logic in the Qur'an [for example] does indicate that the information from Mohammed's entity was not pure - but was corrupt. A God of love and peace who desires to punish when 'he' has no need to?

You only have to read the statement referring to *"tanks, planes and bombs"* in recent Saudi government-published versions to see that the text is being updated [twisted] by men for political gain, proving that the Qur'an is not actually the word of God at all because, anything else was created by the prophet [regardless of where his information actually came from].

How can we believe beyond uncertainty, that Moses wasn't taking doctrine from one of these lost fragments pretending [or even believing itself] to be God? Christian history shows that the Bible is a compilation of edits taken from 87 different books. One of these was written by Mary Magdalene [who spent more time with Jesus than anyone else] and no aspects of her book were included in the compilation [edited by men]. Science has not found one artefact from over half a million people spending any time in the desert - let alone forty years and, Judaism still ignores the science that shows that the world has existed for longer than six thousand years.

Was Moses listening to the word of a God who has no needs and has given us free will, or to his own will and inner fears when he created the Ten Commandments? How is it possible to disobey a God who has no rules? Did God give us free will or not? If God gave us free will, then where do these rules, laws and sins come from? Free will is complete, not partial. How can something be given with both freedom and restrictions at the same time and be called 'free'?

Again, the only way that these contradictions work both ways is if you are religious and refuse to question.

Were both of these men [if Moses even existed at all] exploited by such entities because they were so open and passionate about bringing peace? Could this passion have made them vulnerable if they were not fully aware of the source of their doctrine? After all, God's love is not conditional.

If information truly is divine and meant for all and, if we are all from and connected to

God then why would it need interpreting by self-appointed 'spiritual leaders' or by anyone other than you?

If we are all connected to God and part of God because we are extensions of God, isn't it actually the innate wisdom [not knowledge] that resides within each and every one of us that gives us access to any divine truth? Are we not ALL born with such a connection? Is this not what wisdom is and for why it is different to knowledge? If we used our inner-wisdom [divine connection] to acquire knowledge, then maybe the knowledge acquired would be honest and therefore accurate? Or have you allowed yourself to be conditioned into thinking that wisdom and knowledge are one of the same?

Men wrote all of the books. Within this information is some truth but it has been clouded by the fears and guilt of the male human psyche doing the writing - literally putting words into God's mouth. It's simple; how can any these books be the word of God when they contradict each other and separately, when they contradict the notion that a creator God has no needs? If God has no needs, how are any of these books the word of a God who existed before everything? If they were all the word of God then wouldn't the information between them concur? Wouldn't they have recognised that it is not logical for God to punish us for anything when we have free will - unless God is a liar? Personally, I believe that it is more likely that it is men who lie about God and not God or angels who lie about God.

How to see the truth of the books - not the propaganda of men

Contradictions within information are a sign of conflict and of something that isn't yet settled. If you ignore contradictions that you become aware of, then you are consciously denying yourself a way to a better truth that the contradiction is trying to alert you to.

All you have to do is question anything that you think, read or hear about God, against the notion of God having no needs. Re-member that the 'Devil' does not exist and that the nature of evil is only ever fear and guilt, and so no one could ever really be your enemy. Consider not doing anything to anything else alive that you wouldn't want done to yourself and know that God is with you always regardless of what you think, say or do and will never punish you but will always only love you and that God is concerned ONLY with the essence of your soul.

When you apply this to your reading, you will start to see a different book and a different God. Just one fundamental message will come through; that we have free will and so can do whatever we choose without punishment but, better for all including ourselves if we don't treat anything else that is part of life, in a way that we ourselves would not wish to be treated.

Heaven on Earth is already here

It's no coincidence that we would not be ruled by religious or even common law if we all lived by the notion of not treating anything else that is part of life, in a way that we would not wish to be treated ourselves. We would respect every aspect of the natural planet and we would not judge each other. We would understand that we are all as humans, capable of the same thoughts, words and actions and so we would educate [forgive and encourage] and not punish or condemn. We would realise that in a race where we are all in the same team, we all have to win together or we will win nothing. If just one of us is suffering, we are ALL held-back.

We would deal with our fear and guilt and we would experience that we are not each other's enemies and so there would be no need for law. We would express love without fear and guilt to who ever we felt to express it to. We wouldn't abuse renewable energy sources and we wouldn't stand to live on a planet where 20% have all of the wealth and 80% of the world's rain forests are abused to subsidise our economies when we could instead choose to cultivate hemp for fibre, paper, fuel, medicine, food and much more.

Incidentally, even economies actually need the rain forests to survive so that the planet can survive so that their economies survive [amazingly, this does have to be pointed out because some people still actually believe that the economy's survival is more important than our planet's survival and therefore our own survival].

Every life form on this planet is important because every life form fulfils a purpose that benefits all life on this planet. We do not see the direct affect of each species fulfilling its purpose and so we do not see its existence as relevant and so we take it for granted and abuse it.

During the last fifty years, humans have extinguished 40% of the entire planet's wildlife and if you think that this is somehow part of a natural earth cycle and that approx. 40% of all wildlife gets wiped-out each time during these cycles, go back to sleep.

We do not see how without worms refining the soil and taking leaves underground to rot, we would have none or very little plant life - especially food crops and trees. Predatory feeding systems between species keep population balances in check and enable intersections between food chains, where humans over-consume their food stocks to the point where they extinguish them!

We don't see the impact of the mass-murder of millions of bees [thanks mostly to Monsanto] and how this could bring-about great financial and social collapse of whole societies and we disregard our own littering behaviour in place of demanding more street cleaners.

In his 2013 party leaflet, cowardly Lib Dem campaigner Tanveer Choudhry blames Labour-run Birmingham Council for the rats, rubbish and fly tipping that his constituents have to wade through, while demanding a 100% increase in street sweepers - even though the rats, rubbish and fly tipping are literally products of the life-style choices of his constituents.

He betrays the environment for the sake of a cheap shot at his rivals and, he betrays the uneducated in his own Sparkhill and Sparkbrook constituencies because, by pandering to them instead of working with local community centres [such as forward-thinking Balsall Heath Forum] on educational programmes that could teach them how to respect themselves and their natural environment [as I myself did with the Muslim Brotherhood during 2001/02 and again with BHF in 2009], he demonstrates that he

will prostitute himself for votes at the expense of the environment and, at the expense of his own constituents' self-respect and well-being.

Further to this, it won't matter who the heavily-Islamic people of these areas vote for because unless they freely choose to adapt their own attitude and behaviour, the streets will simply get filthier but, while these and many other communities across the UK are also in a race to see who can convert the most lawns into dead 'gardens' [so they don't have to bother maintaining them] or into drives for their multiple cars, it is their own children who will suffer through an ever-increasing lack of access to nature and, from the effects of an inner-city environment that will become void of natural flora [and therefore also void of bees and of every other form of essential wildlife] and will consist only of rats, rubbish and flies and, guess who they will blame?

The joke in all this is that the same people who demand that more local tax revenue is spent merely cleaning-up after them are the same people who complain about rising Council Tax bills so, if it's personal servants they want, they can pay for this themselves [just like any other individual would have to] or, simply respect their own area and clean-up after themselves - it's a no-brainer!

When a community blames a council or government for its own negative habits, it's time to educate and not to pander and by free choice, potential 'leader' Tanveer betrays his own constituents because he knows that the true issue at play here is that of a serious lack of inner-city community education. For decades, I have consistently demonstrated how 'representatives' don't care for the environment or even for their own voters and so if the people of Sparkhill and Sparkbrook freely choose to vote for betrayal, that's exactly what they'll get and their children will pay the price - not them.

Four hundred and twenty one species of beasts, birds, bugs and plants have already become extinct in the UK over the last two hundred years alone - keep voting and reap!

For what it's worth, rats do not litter-drop [they actually contribute to the daily country-wide clean-up operations] and when it comes to problem solving, they will never repeat an action if the action doesn't yield the intended result first time around. On the other hand, humans consciously and constantly abuse the environment and also repeat the same action until a new problem is born and so, when you consider that both rats and humans are social species, which group is actually vermin?

Combine this selfish and neglectful attitude towards the environment with the will of Muslims to out-breed every other religion [assisted by governments who refuse to restrict Child Benefit eligibility for the first child only - for all families regardless of religion, race etc.] and you will see the future that the people of the UK are actually voting for and therefore co-creating.

Add to this that ants, bees and other non self-aware species from other social groups have been discovered [by British scientists in early 2012] to be using direct democracy for their community decision-making, it is clear that humans are NOT the most intelligent species [as portrayed by politicians and the religions].

Humans are the ONLY social group species on the planet not to use direct democracy and as with everything else within nature and of God, it works and I suggest that we start copying it as soon as possible.

Humans are the only animals that out-eat their food supply [even though they suffer from obesity] to the point where stocks can not even get enough space to reproduce and, whilst species extinction is a natural part of the evolution of nature upon this planet to a certain extent, the rates of extinction are being increased by our abuse of the environment. Each year, up to fifty thousand species disappear along with

potentially healing plant medicines [one hundred and thirty seven per day/six per hour/one every ten minutes]!

It has only recently been discovered that the dinosaurs were made extinct by a global atmospheric methane release caused by the warming of trapped underground methane cells that melted as a result of a meteorite crash, and not by the meteorite crash itself. Due to rising temperatures, these cells are now releasing methane columns into the atmosphere again and, methane release itself causes temperature increases and so, we are now re-starting a catch 22 situation that no politician or lamestream 'news' network is prepared to inform you about.

Even disregarding the effects of climate change, how do humans expect to survive when all food and medicine derives from nature and when we're killing it all?

The religions condition us into believing that everything was placed upon this planet for us by God and so we over-consume and over-breed with no thought for the planet or its future because we've made our beliefs more important - even if they are killing us!

If we simply keep blaming our suffering and poor decision-making upon God's will while continuing to deny responsibility for how our greed and arrogance are ruining this planet, humans will soon extinguish themselves. The planet will eventually recover from our abuse and life will continue but, without us [just as it used to].

Religious self-righteousness and partisan politics kills, yet the masses continue to pray and to vote for others to deal with the results of their own neglectful behaviour. If we woke up and gave a shit, we wouldn't buy products from companies that needlessly create a demand for timbre [such as news papers] and that waste paper on blind and un-targeted mail-shots or leaflet and brochure campaigns [instead of capitalising on the use of the Internet or other digital media]. Organisations that still use un-targeted paper-based marketing media [such as Virgin] are organisations whose owners put their ego and profits before the well-being of the planet and the rest of us. Through the implementation of such wasteful policies, these proprietors give the impression that they are only concerned that the planet supports them during their lifetime because if these people thought that their negative actions would come back on them [through reincarnation], you can bet that their operations would then be far more ethical and considerate. Companies that operate like this while their proprietors talk-up saving the environment are non-ecological and are also inefficient companies, whilst companies that optimise actually save money and are more efficient and it's no coincidence. Companies that are more efficiently-ran are companies that offer more value for money and are more forward-thinking and so will often be more customer-focused too.

Capitalist business models that maximise so as to create an ever-expanding profit margin will evolve as they real-ise that maximisation is not necessary in order to sustain a company's profit margin. These new businesses will pay higher wages than they need to, will involve their employees in decisions that will affect them, will respect their local environment and ecology and so will become more democratic and more environmentally aware.

Planting a seed and maintaining its growth through to it becoming an edible food is capitalism and it's fair and it's sustainable if we democratise and optimise [as in nature] instead of maximise. Put simply; optimising is God's way of doing business and direct democracy is God's way of doing politics!

If the Bible and the Qur'an are the two most popular books in the world, then between them they have cost more forest timber than any other publication on the planet. Through religious self-righteousness and the desire [it is not a need] to dominate and

control, the religions and their fearful and/or psychotic and/or unquestioning followers are directly responsible for harming the natural environment and, as they are a cause of destruction in our natural physical world, they are also destructive to our emotional and mental balance too. These books that are supposed to show us how to live in harmony with God and nature are destroying nature and all life on this planet with their 'word of God' who is needy and is of judgement, vengeance, hatred, fear and punishment.

The 'need' of deluded and scared men to control mass populations with the 'great' books of the 'word of God' are contributing to the rape of the planet's natural environment but, this is okay because we're a Christian or a Muslim or a Catholic or a Jew or a Mormon and our way is the 'right' and only way to God – even though God is with ALL anyway [we are ALL already home because God has disconnected from no one]!

If the words in these books are worth anything or are so 'right', why is the world so poor and so fucking dying? If Islam and Judaism [all forms] are the world's most popular religions and if most of the world's population follows one of these religions, then the perceptions and actions of the people of these religions are at the heart of all of our problems individually and globally. What is mostly at the root of this is the religious perception of God as being a needy and punishing God, combined with the perception that our planet and our lives are just for the testing of our moral conduct, and for point-scoring with God.

If we real-ised that Heaven was on Earth, we would not allow our councils to clear grass areas of their leaves just because it looks more pleasing to the human eye because, leaves that fall to the ground are taken beneath the surface by worms where they break up and rot to fertilise the soil that trees drink nutrients from. We would not allow our councils to clear grassy areas of their weeds by using chemical fertilisers because, any weed [including Japanese Knot Weed] can be killed simply by removing new shoots as they appear and before they photosynthesise. Using this method also means that you don't even have to reach the root to remove it and, an added bonus is that the dead root will break-down into organic fertiliser.

We would use our freedom to take responsibility for our lives and we would implement truly democratic systems and we would make decisions for ourselves instead of electing so-called 'representatives'. We would not let governments go to war in our name, in God's name, and against our wishes because we could install direct democracy using the Internet - if we so choose.

We could choose to implement a transition from government-rule to self-rule by voting any government into an administration. Decisions regarding individual policies would be transferred directly to the people via the Internet but, administered and implemented into law by an administration of the people. If the majority of the UK population voted for this transition at any time, it would be illegal [according to UK law, European law and international law] for any party to claim to be the government. In such a situation, any government that attempted to form and to adopt power would [according to these laws] become an unelected dictatorship.

How could any politician deny the people the chance to decide how we will all live, and continue to claim to be working in our best democratic interests? If any did, it would prove that they do actually have their own agenda for power and control over others.

Conservative MP Anne Widdecombe stated that she would *"never let majority public opinion voiced on my website influence my parliamentary votes and I would never let voters make decisions upon policy implementation."* Before realising who he was talking with, MP George Galloway told me directly that *"Direct democracy is the best way for the country to go!"* adding *"You could get rid of all us lot too."* confirming that

we can have what hypocritical politicians admit is best for us but, only when it doesn't compromise what's best for them.

The only MP to recognise and to publicly call for true direct democracy [as opposed to limited public participation] is Labour's Kevin Brennan who in 2012, told a Hansard Society event at Westminster that; *"Technologically it is now possible. We could function as a direct democracy. The cost of obtaining people's views on a range of different subjects is minuscule compared to any other time in history, unless you go back to ancient Greece when you just gathered in the market place and you could have a direct vote on things."*

Other 'representative' MPs [such as Douglas Carswell and Zac Goldsmith] who say that they are pro-direct democracy are merely heading-up anti-direct democracy propaganda campaigns on the behalf of their parties that are designed to make you think that public participation alone is direct democracy. Direct democracy demands that the public participates so as to be able to decide upon the implementation of ALL laws and not just the ones that MPs let us decide upon!

We are all educated enough to decide upon our own destiny. Making a decision about how we want to live is not a decision for 'experts', 'leaders', corrupt politicians or self-deluded 'psychics'. It is a decision for you because you are the expert in this field. Are you ready to take responsibility for your own life and your choices or are you still going to blame politicians, God, the 'Devil' and the rest of the world?

The word democracy is Greek in origin [demokratia] and means 'rule of the people' – not 'rule over the people'.

Representative democracy [representative rule of the people] is an illusion and doesn't even exist because while we do have the rule of representatives, we do not have any rule of the people. Democracy has been stolen by the so-called 'representatives' and under them it has regressed so by continuing to empower them, the electorate is freely voting for its own oppression.

Why should anyone respect laws that govern their lives when they've had no say in these laws?

Democracy is purely and ONLY defined by the people [the majority party in any state] being able to control the rule of law. It is not defined by fairness, freedom or even by common sense. These are merely potential components of a democracy [even then only of a liberal democracy] and are not themselves the definition of democracy. Therefore, there are currently no democracies in the world and there hasn't been since the concept left its Greek birth-place.

Within a democracy, it would be just as possible for the majority to decide to oppress various options, as it would be for the majority to decide to liberate various options. For example: freedom of speech is something that a majority could vote to protect and enhance through common law so that it can be used as a form of expression. In the UK, freedom of speech still has no legal basis and is still a 'right' that is tolerated [up to a point]. The majority have never decided upon the laws that govern it and instead, it chooses to elect 'representatives' to make these decisions on its behalf. Unlike the US and many other countries, UK representatives have never enshrined the right to freedom of speech on behalf of those who freely elect them.

When people elect representatives, democracy [majority rule] is void and the rule of the people is replaced by the rule of a minority because, periodically selecting representatives is the only 'democratic' aspect available to the people and no member of the majority has any policy decision-making responsibility unless given via referenda. Therefore, leaving aside the many flaws and corruption that exist in all of the world's current so-called 'representative' democracies, representative democracy

is itself a contradiction in terms because we have the rule of the representative and not the rule of the people.

Direct democracy is true democracy [rule of the people directly and without representatives] and even though it is the only true form of democracy and should therefore be known simply as democracy, it is known as 'direct democracy' to distinguish it from many of today's false interpretations.

For practical and financial reasons, it has not been possible to give the electorate referenda on all policies within any system - even if a government itself desired to but, since the inventions of both the Internet and the World Wide Web, these practical and financial obstacles can now be removed and ALL can have an input into the laws that govern them.

With direct democracy, there is also no longer any requirement for representation and there is no need for the electorate to have to attend inefficient and mismanaged polling stations to vote on policies.

It is simply because we do not understand the true experience or definition of democracy, that politicians are able to assume the power that they do. Most of them actually believe in the same definition of the word and most of them believe that we have the fairest system possible and this was probably true to some extent - until the birth of the Internet but guess who will tell you that the 'Devil' resides in the Internet? the Muslims and the Christians of course! ...while at the same time using it for their own purposes.

I've just read an Islamic leaflet explaining about how the Shaytan controls the Internet and on the reverse, I see that it was compiled by www.sistersproject.co.uk and www.maktabah.net so work that one out?

Do you really think it's a coincidence that the world's two most obnoxious religions are telling us of how the tool for peace, unity, self-rule and direct democracy is a tool of the 'Devil'?

Some politicians do know the truth of the definition of the word democracy. They know that we don't know what it really means and they wish for things to remain as they are - a theocratic dictatorship in disguise where they share it every five years among their friends before flying-off to another country to sell how they did it for £40K per hour, leaving us to reap what we let them sew in our name!

We already have all of the freedom and power that we could ever need to achieve anything! It is an illusion that the people don't already have power. Whilst we don't believe that we have power, we abuse it. When politicians tell us that they want to give us more power, they reinforce the notion that we don't already have all of the power and the illusion is maintained but, only because we do not real-ise that we already have all of the power [the ability to choose to vote to maintain a theocracy, or to choose to vote for direct democracy].

Money is not power. Money enables for the ability to make more choices but can never be used to control others without others in some way choosing to be controlled. This makes money power-less. It is freedom [the ability to make choices] that is the only power.

The US government, Microsoft, Google, Yahoo and Sisco all claim to be companies that support democracy and all boast of how our use of the Internet can enhance democracy, yet the US government allows these 'democratic' corporations to sell Internet filtration software [tools of oppression] directly to dictatorships with poor human rights records [such as China, Bahrain and Saudi Arabia]. There are Chinese citizens who are serving up to ten years in hard labour camps for publishing blogs that simply question their 'leaders' because at the request of the Chinese government,

Yahoo submitted the account details of these bloggers [its own users and customers] so that they could be traced, tried, and imprisoned. This could not have happened without intelligence supplied by Yahoo - a democratic corporation from a democratic country?

These 'pro-democratic' companies have fought each other tooth and nail [particularly Microsoft and Google] to win contracts from oppressive regimes - whilst boasting about how they are the world 'leaders' in democratic systems. Western governments even force unwanted 'democracies' onto other countries so that the illusion proliferates further [along with the oppression] and, all of this happens whilst the US government denounces China [for example] for its poor human rights record? Have you noticed that over the last decade, the voices of protests against the Chinese government have become quieter and more accommodating as the Chinese economy grows?

True democracy is purely about ONLY majority decisions becoming policy and under this definition, we are ALL currently living within dictatorships. Not one country is currently a true democracy and incidentally, the Greeks invented democracy [not 'representative' democracy] and even without the web, the Greeks decided upon ALL laws and NEVER voted to elect representatives and, the inventor of the web himself [Tim Berners-Lee] says; *"The web is not as powerful as it could be. We need to learn to use it to solve our problems."*

The faster empires break-up, the better-off we'll all be because hundreds of new cultures [regional tribes] living side-by-side with their own direct democracies will simultaneously bring true democracy to the world, while preventing any centralised world order.

In societies where the majority rule and the public vote on all policy implementation via the web and phone, governments would become administrations of the people carrying out the will of the people, for the people. Any of this sound familiar? Wasn't this the original intention of those who fought to take power from the ruling monarchs in the UK? Wasn't this the big idea of the founding fathers of the US?

Eventually, we would not fear to the point where we would think that we actually have to own or control anything outside of ourselves and so we would share more. Sharing reduces our negative impact on the environment and not owning anything would eliminate the concept of theft because if no one owned anything, no one could steal anything. What would be the benefit to anyone in stealing something that they could obtain simply by asking or swapping? We would probably all be richer anyway.

This would also mean that fewer people would feel the need to own items purely on the basis that others have them because, simply just owning something in itself would lose its status and people would instead put their self-worth into something more worthy than their objects.

People who are greedy are greedy simply because they fear not having enough of something so, if the cause of this fear is eradicated [if people knew they would always have enough], there would be no purpose for greed. The sad thing is that if we chose to live like this right now, every family on the planet would not have what they need - they would have so much more! Recent studies have demonstrated that there is enough wealth on the planet so that only one person would need to work for just two days per week to fend for a family of five members and, other studies also show how the entire planet's wealth is owned by only around three hundred families - such as the Rothschilds and Rockefellers.

If our economy is making life difficult and restrictive then we can choose to reform it or to just dump it. If we choose to let go of the idea of ownership and of property and

we real-ised that nature already covers all of our needs, we could then trade without currency. We could democratically ensure the equal distribution of wealth and eventually, charities would have no purpose and so would no longer exist.

All social group animals on this planet except for humans live like this and so in my view, humans are actually the least developed and least intelligent of all social species on this planet. We have misled ourselves into believing that we have progressed, where really we have regressed [we have separated and distanced ourselves from nature].

All other social group species on this planet use direct democracy to make decisions that benefit the collective and, they don't need a currency and a job simply to survive. Humans do not live within direct democracies and have swapped living with nature for surviving with currencies and this has generated much fear throughout the world which is expressed through greed and insecurity and often results in wars.

While there will be many who will disagree with certain elements of the following overview, it is written from my own perception based upon my own direct experiences and beliefs acquired through political activism since 1999 and, which has included working [independently] with many of the groups [or their connections] that I have listed. Many will consider it to be a conspiracy theory but for me, it is a truth.

For decades, a war has been raging in the background. It remains hidden behind a mirage of propaganda created by the mainstream news agencies and, hidden from humans who have over-dosed on TV soaps, X Factor, Hip Pop music, BBC and tabloid news, alcohol, celebrity sex, and themselves.

It is a global war between finance and true democracy and the outcome will result in either more 'representative' politics, dictatorships, war and environmental catastrophe or, direct democracy, peace, fair economics and a chance to save our species. The two sides [which I refer to as the Financials and the Democratics] have very simple aims and surprisingly, even though the methods used by each side vary dramatically, their aims are similar.

The Financials

- The Rothschild and Rockefeller families [mostly]
- EU and US governments
- ALL 'representative' political parties
- Covert pro-revolutionaries
- Traditional members and reformists of all religions
- Most heads of various UK and US intelligence agencies
- NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organisation]
- PNAC [Project for the New American Century]
- Masons [even though well-intended members are not aware of their part in the war]
- David Ike [whose People's Voice PA rip-off is part-funded by neo-conservative Jews]
- Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International [CIA pro-war propaganda groups]
- London School of Economics
- Food, drug and energy companies [such as Monsanto]
- Oil and fracking companies
- Telecomms companies and ISPs
- Some technology manufacturers [such as Microsoft, Apple, Google, Yahoo, Cisco]
- Anti-climate change propagandists
- Pro-war propagandists
- Banks
- Mainstream news agencies
- Major music media organisations
- Musical puppets and performers [Jay-Z, Kanye West, Beyoncé, Rihanna, Cyrus]

- Hollywood and Bollywood members

Ultimate Aim:

To achieve total and complete control of every aspect of every person's life from birth to death at the expense of the poor [in terms of costs to health and wealth], simply in order to guarantee their own family's security.

Propaganda campaign:

- Miseducation about the definitions of the words; Democracy, Freedom and Power
- Influencing people to think that public participation is direct democracy
- Misinformation designed to alienate the poor and the vulnerable
- Miseducation regarding medicines [incorporating anti-marijuana propaganda]
- Miseducation regarding already-existing free, clean and sustainable energy solutions
- Miseducation regarding the nature of God
- Misinformation regarding Western military and political foreign interventions

Weapons systems:

- Capital reserves counted in £Trillions
- Exclusive control of the rule of law [through 'representative' democracies]
- Passion for money
- Desire for control
- Experience
- TV, Radio, Magazine, Web
- Technology
- UK and US intelligence agencies
- NATO
- Proxy wars and incitement of armed minorities to oust elected governments
- US Military Industrial Complex
- US and emerging UK Prison Industrial Complexes
- Banking practices and legislation
- Child education systems
- Mainstream news media
- Songs performed by musical puppets and musical porn star performers
- Hollywood and Bollywood films

The Democraticals

- A small group of governments outside of the EU and US
- Some members of various UK and US intelligence agencies
- Some reformist followers of all religions
- Direct Democracy and other progressive political parties and movements
- Big Brother Watch and Electronic Frontier Foundation
- Overt pro-revolutionaries and protest groups
- Pro-democracy activists
- Pro-eco capitalist activists
- Anti-capitalist activists
- Anti-poverty groups
- Environmental campaigners
- Child welfare campaigners
- Hacktivist groups
- Alternative and non-EU and US news agencies
- Independent music organisations
- Independent musicians [mostly within Folk, Hip Hop, Drum and Bass, Rap]
- Independent film companies
- Visual and Performance artists

- Poets
- Comedians

Ultimate Aim:

Being that the Democrats are highly fragmented and of such varied orientation, it would be unrealistic to specify a singular aim. Also, some actually have hidden agendas [usually concerned about changing places and not systems] which run contrary to their own activism [which I refer to as 'Animal Farm' syndrome] but speaking for myself, I aim to achieve security for every family, every animal, and every plant. Unlike the Financials, myself and others strive to guarantee security for more than just our own families because put simply, we do not share the fears that motivate the Financials.

Propaganda campaign:

- Specifically oriented in directly countering the propaganda of the Financials, while introducing potential solutions and new philosophy.

Weapons systems:

- The truth
- Passion for true democracy
- Passion for justice
- Passion for technology
- Passion for nature
- Experience
- Courage
- Determination
- Creativity
- The web
- Technology
- Hacks and EDS attacks
- Music
- Visual and Performance art
- Poetry
- Comedy

So as not to inadvertently benefit the Financials, I choose not to disclose my perceived weaknesses of either side and to publish only some strengths [weapons] of the Democrats.

There is no neutrality. People and parties not listed as members of either side are not neutral because through their money and their vote, every person in the world is responsible for their own country's system of governance and business culture. With every decision, every person is influencing and shaping the world every day and so we are ALL responsible. The ONLY difference between all people anywhere in the world is whether they choose to take-up this responsibility or to continue to deny it by empowering corrupt and broken so-called 'representative' partisan political systems.

Regardless of any influences, the side you stand with is chosen by your daily actions [not by your words] so, whatever the eventual outcome is of this war, we as a species would have chosen it.

We have given up our lives so as to earn money simply just to survive [not to live] and we have called this progress but, our capitalist business modules that use maximisation will also fail because they are not optimising. Nothing in nature maximises but instead always only optimises [only taking the resources that it needs, not the most that it can acquire].

GMO 'solutions' are not solutions because there is nothing useless or malfunctioning within nature that needs to be fixed - other than the damage that we have caused. Food shortages are due to greed and poor distribution, not lack of food. GMO 'solutions' do not address our greed and desire to control and restrict the lives of others so, no increase in the amount of GMO crop cultivation [even if it was ever to be proved safe] will feed the starving and, you will see this for yourself.

Humans invented currency. Its purpose was not born of a need and so money was not found in nature and so it is instead a manufactured product and we have since conditioned ourselves into believing that we need currencies just to survive [another illusion]. Human life and trade was happening for thousands of years before the invention of currency and the formation of currency-based economies. Money was invented purely to regulate greed [which is fear-oriented].

If you think that the concept of bartering and sharing in today's world is naive, then you should know that the Chinese and US governments have been trading without currency for years by literally trading through straight-swaps because they can't afford to trade through currency because their paper bills are becoming less valuable [particularly the US Dollar].

If governments can choose to do do-away with currency systems when it suits them, then within a true democracy where the majority makes all of the policy decisions, why can't we also? The truth is that we can because we have free will. We can choose to use that free will to remain controlled and divided by a minority of scared and twisted men or, we can choose to use our free will to break free of the old ways of thinking and of just surviving, and we can all start living.

This is the Heaven on Earth that we can create and it's potential has been here all along with all of our needs [and more] provided for by nature. With fear and guilt, we look by using our eyes and not by using our minds and so we don't see that we could have Heaven on Earth and so instead, we abuse and destroy it. All we have to do is real-ise this and apply what we can assume through logic alone [that a God who existed before everything has no needs]. Doing this will change our perception of God and therefore, of what we currently think that God desires from us. This in turn will change our morals and this will then change our laws because our laws are based upon our morals and our morals are based upon our perception of the nature of God.

If the current global religious perception of God is so correct and so appropriate, why is the world so damaged and so poor? The relationship between our laws, morals, and related behaviours dictate that the way the way the world turns is the direct result of these elements - with the warped and contradictory religious perception of God being at the root of it all.

In all cultures, we debate moral issues without even acknowledging that there isn't actually a standardised moral code anywhere that we have all agreed to share and as such, we debate morals as 'facts' instead of as merely opinions. The reason for why this is so dangerous is because our common laws come from our morals [religious-influenced principals] instead of from our ethics [non-religious principals] and, all morals come ONLY from what the religious believe God wants from us. What we think God wants from us stems from our perception of the nature of God and so, if the religious perception of the nature of God is inaccurate and if most people on this planet follow a religion, this explains how the way that we live as 'God'-fearing humans is damaging to all life on this planet because, it is the religions themselves who actually confirm that their own perception of the nature of God is inaccurate.

If you think that everything is rosy in the garden and that the world is fair or, if you think it's a job for someone else, then you probably don't see the need to change anything within you and so will continue to blame God and the 'Devil' or your

'enemies' for everything and anything – and to vote for 'representatives'.

Approximately fifty thousand animal and plant species become extinct every year [which threatens the food chain and substantially reduces the potential for finding medical cures] because we choose to empower those who refuse to prioritise protecting the natural environment, instead of choosing to take responsibility ourselves through direct democracy.

If you think that everything's not so rosy in the garden and you would like to take some responsibility [even if only for children, animals and plants who aren't ever considered], then consider shifting your perception of God to that of one that is more of a God and less of a human [or a 'Devil'] by re-remembering that God has no needs.

Re-member that God existed before religion [a man-made tool of oppression] and that most religions were not actually established by the prophets themselves, and you will find a new God who resides outside of religion and away from the corruption of the religious 'experts'.

Politicians, scientists, philosophers, religions and none of the other 'experts' have been able to answer the fundamental questions about who and what we are and what our purpose is. Whilst religions come with a list of God's needs and rules, no religion even has their own explanation [or even a theory] for the birth or creation of the God that they seem to understand the nature of so well.

It is my belief that we exist [as humans] because we are the part of a creative God who chose to experience Godself through physicality in human form and, that all within the physical universe is an aspect of God expressing and experiencing Godself through the medium of physicality. Without the creation of a physical realm, God can not experience or express through physicality and this is why in order to accept and understand the nature of the spirit, we must also embrace and enjoy the physical. Without doing this, how can true, full, human spiritual enlightenment be attained when humans have both spiritual and physical aspects? How can true enlightenment ever be achieved through self-harm?

Maybe life is just to live in joy for the most positive that you know your self to be? We are all the experts in defining our own purpose and potential so it is us who have to find the answers and this is why questioning is so important.

If you don't believe that you can change the world for the better then wake up! We are all shaping and changing the world with every thought, word and action that we create in every moment of our lives and just because you don't see the effect of this from a global perspective doesn't mean that it isn't happening. The power to affect positive change in the world lies in knowing this and the lack of this knowledge is one of the key differences between those who do affect conscious change and those who don't.

Those who tell you that to dream is futile, are those who have forgotten that everything in their lives, their environment and in their reality was once a dream in someone's head before it was real-ised. They may be fearful of you suffering [as they may have for their failed dreams] but try not to let someone else's fears or guilt become the enemy that stops you from fully real-ising who you are and what purpose you chose in life before being born.

If you do, you will not be able to blame them for any resentment that you may come to experience because it would have been you who made the decision to give up - regardless of the influences around you. We all make our own choices right down to the last before death and while this is true, we are ALL already free.

The Creation of God

Everything that we call reality - from the simple light bulb through to crafts that fly in space was at one time initially only a thought. Energised thoughts become dreams and with practical and mental application, these dreams can then become reality.

Reality is simply; the sum of all that can be measured by your senses [physical or other]. Your reality is; the sum of all that you yourself can measure. If something can be measured [by any means], then it exists.

From a chronological perspective, If everything that we call 'reality' all stems from a single thought, was this first thought actually what we now call God?

The birth of what we call God could have been the moment when pure thought energy evolved to the point where it realised that it was actually a thought - that it existed - that it thought. At this point, the thought would have become self-aware.

If God was initially simply a thought becoming self-aware, this also means that God is not a 'he'. If God is the source of all thought and is non-physical and therefore physically asexual, isn't God both masculine and feminine? Isn't therefore the nature of God as much feminine as it is masculine?

Why is it that women within the Christian faith have had to fight for the right to become ordained [when it was a woman who created the essence of the Bible?] and a woman still can not become an imam or a rabbi? Do men fear women being of equal status in the religion? Do men fear women having an equal relationship with God? Do men fear women having authority over what is their 'word of God'? Do men fear an innate connection between God and women that reduces their control and excludes them? Do men fear that women may start revealing ideas of a feminine God? Oh no, what then? If [by any definition] we are all created in God's image, then don't women represent God's femininity? Wouldn't that make God as effeminate as much as masculine? Wouldn't this bring balance? Why do things of nature have an effeminate look and feel to them? Why does nature nurture and, isn't nurturing generally a feminine trait?

At some point, humans naturally reach a stage where they become aware of their thoughts and of themselves so, maybe evolution and nature [including God], have been happening since before the first conscious thought? This would mean that God is part of nature because the occurrence of the birth of God [the evolving thought] was a natural occurrence - an evolutionary step.

Take the light bulb; as you look at one you see at first just a light bulb. Before it was a light bulb it was a dream. Before it was a dream it was just a thought. The thought was given energy through questioning, dreaming, trancing, visualising, meditating, wishing etc. and it then became a powerful dream. Through practical application and determination, the energy from the dream then evolves into the light bulb and it is now a reality. The energy that created the dream has undergone a process and changed its form and has become something a lot more tangible.

Now, take the first original thought that eventually evolved into the light bulb. If all thoughts are connected and if life is a resulting consequence of cause and effect between them, it could be that all thoughts stem from just one initial conscious thought. If that first initial conscious thought was the question "*What am I?*" then this may have been the creation/birth of a conscious God and may have been when God started exploring through creation.

This would be God starting to learn about Godself and all of what we call reality [all that can be measured] is the result so far.

To summarise; All of what we call life/reality may have started when the first thought form that became self-aware asked itself "*What am I?*" After all, isn't this what self-aware humans do?

God is a product of nature - not the other way around

If there was a moment between the first thought being just a thought, and then realising that it was a thought [becoming self-aware], this would indicate that there was something already going on before the creation of God [if God was the first thought that became self-aware]. Whatever was going on before the creation of God must have been natural because it had no interference from man [just to emphasise; nature is not just trees and other green stuff]!

This would imply that the creation of God was a natural occurrence and, being that the nature of nature is to evolve, anything from nature would also have the nature to evolve - like a genetic transfer. If God was created as part of nature then this would explain why God [as just a thought] would have at some point, naturally evolved.

This evolution could have occurred when the thought real-ised that it was a thought and if the thought was somehow created before nature existed, then where would the gene for evolution come from if it couldn't come from an unconscious thought and, if there was nothing natural in existence already?

If the moment of the creation of God was the first event to ever happen and, before the creation of nature, then as this was an evolution, what was happening before the evolution? What was happening before the thought became conscious? What ever it was, how could it be unnatural?

Something must have already been happening before the first thought became self-aware because there was a time when the thought was not conscious [not self-aware] in a time before the thought became what we call God. Whatever was going on had no interference from man and so therefore must have been natural so from a chronological perspective, God and all life is energy just changing form and evolving and with varying degrees of density and consciousness.

From a non-chronological perspective, all of this [all of life] is occurring in a single moment because, thought evolution traverses no time. God and humans choosing to experience physical life chronologically is what allows for the opportunity for experience itself because if we removed chronological time from the equation, we'd have the knowledge but wouldn't have the experience and this would therefore invalidate any reason or purpose for souls choosing to be born into human bodies. If you already believe in reincarnation and somehow believe that we inhabit our lives so that we can learn of why we made the choices we made, re-member that in seeing your whole life's events before you adopted it, you would have already seen the answers to any question you may have now.

How nature and life have existed forever

Life [in some form] has existed forever without a chronological start point because, if you imagine this initial thought [a singular God] existing in its universe/dimension, where did it come from and what was it before it was even just an unconscious thought? Whatever it was - it was something. It existed in one form or another and for it to exist even just as an unconscious thought, it must have always existed as something - just changing in form and density.

Imagine holding a sheet of Rizla paper [or any oblong-shaped piece of paper] in your hand and then cutting it exactly in half. Throw half away so that you're now just holding the remaining half. Repeat the process of halving what you have left until you are down to the last fibre in your hand. Imagine cutting this fibre right down to its final atom. Cut this atom in half and you have one thousand nano atoms [according to both Classical and Quantum science]. Imagine keeping just one nano atom and throwing the rest away. Take this final nano atom and cut it in half. Do you see the pattern? Do you see that you will always have some-thing to cut in half? Do you see that the original piece of paper always existed but just changes form and density as it grows and evolves into a piece of paper? What you hold may get smaller and smaller in size but, it will always exist because once something exists, it exists forever in some form or other.

Do you see how this pattern will continue indefinitely - that you will always have something to cut in half? This is how all things have always existed forever but, have just continually changed in form and density - they have evolved and, it is at this quantum level that ALL is connected. If you did end up at a point where you were holding no-thing in your hands, then how could this no-thing ever have become something [a piece of paper]? Where would it have come from? What would it have evolved from? If you imagine holding no-thing, then how does this no-thing evolve into something, without it at first being some-thing itself?

This principal is demonstrated on every electronic memory drive in the world because, the reason for why a file or programme can never be truly deleted is because once it exists, all you can do is change its form. Even specialist wiping software that 'deletes' files beyond recovery merely changes the form of the file according to each utility's own algorithm. The more changes that can be applied to the file, combined with the ability to disguise the algorithm used to make these changes [so that it can not be reverse-engineered], the better the wiping utility. The developers of wiping utility software understand that once something exists, all you can do is change its form and so, this is how wiping utilities work.

It is also the reason for why we are running-out of space for landfill sites because, if it was possible to delete our waste instead of simply changing its form, we wouldn't need landfill sites.

This theory suggests that God and everything has always existed in one form or another forever and therefore, that all possible dimensions/universes and all within them have also existed in one form or another forever and, without a definable chronological start point in space or time. This would also explain how there is no physical boundary or limits to our universe because, what is there that our universe would expand into as it grew if it had physical limits or boundaries? Is it nothing? Perceived 'nothing' is itself something so, if there is [as some believe] a physical boundary to our universe, there must be something [even if 'nothing'] outside of such a boundary [meaning that it isn't actually a boundary]. For 'nothing' to occupy physical space, it must at least be something so, wouldn't this 'nothing' simply just be more of what we call the universe? In terms of space, I can't help thinking that the

recent discovery by scientists of Dark Matter answers this fully.

Take the Big Bang Theory; before the universe was formed, nothing existed but somehow and despite nothing being in existence, some gases exploded resulting in the birth of the universe - and can any scientist who still sells this bullshit explain where these gases came from and what they were existing in if there was no universe? No!

The reason for why they can't explain this is because their chronological-only time-related perception and beliefs restrict them from seeing how the universe has always existed in some form or another, without a chronological start-point.

Incidentally, I'm referring to the same school of scientists and 'experts' who still struggle to define reality - even though I have done this myself in the previous chapter!

As with classical scientists who used to believe in voids that contained literally nothing [before the discovery by quantum scientists of Anti-Matter and Dark Matter], many people do not see how there is no such thing as nothing and so, they do not see how if we took away the universe, there would still be something and, they instead believe that there would be literally no thing [a void]. In relation to this restricted belief, they also fail to see how the universe does not have a physical boundary and that if it did, there would be something outside of this boundary and that when discovered, we would incorporate this something into what we already know and call the universe.

Basically, old school scientists and the religious talk about the birth and boundary of the universe when maybe they should be talking in terms of the birth and boundary of the known universe - if at all?

An ever-growing number of classical scientists accept that there is no such thing as a void and that it exists only as a concept but, the people who these 'experts' have influenced with their prior beliefs have not moved-on and still believe that the universe exists in a void which it expands into as it grows. I myself believe that the known universe exists within an infinitely-sized pool of Dark Matter and that it is this that the known universe continues to expand into and I believe that generally, humans just can't get their heads around the existence of infinity and so perceive it merely as a concept.

Time is not a tangible object or a dimension and is a human concept and was invented and conceived by humans living within the experience of human chronological existence. We experience life as humans chronologically, sequentially, one event after another [one choice after another]. Time enables us to define the past, present and future from within a human-experience perspective but outside of the human experience and human perspective, there is no aspect of time and everything happens [or has happened] instantaneously, in a single [on-going] moment.

Everything happens instantaneously because thought energy traverses no time in evolving from one stage to the next - it is instant, in a moment. As soon as a thought is created, its creation also then exists [in one form or another]. If there is no past, present and future and everything is happening in the same instant moment, this means that anything and everything that could have happened, has already actually happened. We are just experiencing these events chronologically, one choice after another. Chronological time allows for experience and from a certain perspective, this would mean that every choice that you could ever make at any given junction in ALL of your reincarnative lives has already been made but, just not yet experienced. Throughout our lives, most of us are conscious and aware only of the life path and dimension that we presently consciously occupy so, maybe we get to choose to experience the results of making different choices in different lives/incarnations? If so,

it would be only after our death that time travel is be possible.

After we die, we may choose not to adopt and inhabit the next life immediately. We may choose to experience our heaven for a 'long' period while we decide upon which experiences we want to evolve through next time around. Removing the aspect of time would mean that you are actually already in Heaven and with God [source] now but, that your general consciousness and self-awareness is currently here and Earth-bound. Therefore, you exists in both [if not more] dimensions simultaneously. It is not time that is traversed but it is instead dimensions and layers of consciousness that are traversed and, we travel though them by shifting our awareness - whether after death/rebirth or, through developing and shifting conscious awareness from one dimension to another before death.

Our reality consists of things that can be measured by our senses [physical or other]. If you remove the concept of time from your perception of reality, you will see that everything in your reality is in all places at all times – that everything is happening in the same moment so from this perspective, everything is in all places in this same moment.

To summarise; if my theory about time is correct then it has many wonderful implications – just one of them being that when we die, we get to be with everyone we think we're going to leave behind and miss and who would miss us. It would be that we are all always in Heaven, merely projecting an aspect of ourselves [actors] into our Earth-bound roles and, this would be one reason for why the soul resides outside and around the physical body and not inside it [for a soul to exist and inhabit a physical body, it would need to be of a heavy degree of physical density itself so as to remain inside the body as and when the body physically moves].

Everything that exists IS proof of the existence of God [just not the psychopathic tyrannical religious God] because if God was a thought that became self-aware and all things are created by and from this thought kick-starting a process of creation and exploration by asking the question "*What am I?*" then everything is God and God is everything. God is not 'apart' from anything, but is instead 'a part' of everything and, God is therefore already with everything at all times – including us. It is because God is with everything and is everything that it will always be possible to see beauty in anyone - however 'ugly' the initial perception may seem.

Everything that we do is natural [however beautiful or repulsive]. Every form of expression is natural. They may not be popular, common, appropriate, acceptable or legal but, they are still natural and, everything we produce [however artificial or synthetic] is derived from nature.

Why would God punish us for exploring and expressing our nature? Why would God punish Godself? Is it a coincidence that the religions distort the true definition of free will [never acknowledging that their 'God' has attached conditions to this 'free will' that 'he' gives] or, is there a reason behind this so-called 'coincidence'?

Reincarnation, reading the future, the meaning of your name and spirit guides

If all of life is the result of what happens when God asks "*What am I?*" isn't this then the one question that drives all of our lives individually as well as all of life collectively? If we are always growing and evolving, this means that we never get to a point where we can completely/perfectly answer this question and that's the point; this question will always exist and its existence ensures that life is circular and therefore continual.

If we did get to such a point, the second we've reviewed what we would then know of ourselves, it would be secondary [old] data because we would have evolved just simply for having this additional knowledge of our new self. There would now be some more of us to get to know and experience and express so, off we go again in the circle of life trying to answer that question through chronological experience.

There would never be a point where this question is answered and, it is not knowing the answer that ensures that life is forever on-going and if life is circular then wouldn't reincarnation be an important part of the process, enabling us to return to experience more of life on Earth - being and expressing what we are up to that point?

After physical death, we may choose to go to 'Hell', Heaven, somewhere else, or to return to Earth because, we have free will.

We may choose to return because if we were in our own custom-built heaven after a physical life death and we knew that we could come back to it at any point, wouldn't life on Earth seem like the most amazing adventure? Wouldn't you enjoy a game where you get infinitely free lives and can choose your every move? Maybe create your own scenarios and settings - your next Earthly life experience? If this is so then it's also likely that you would have seen your own death and if this is so, this would mean that we all die when we have chosen to [even if indirectly] and, in-line with having free will.

If we have seen our entire life before we choose to experience it, this also suggests that as part of choosing that life, we consciously choose our parents. As there is no such thing as 'random' [it is merely another delusional human concept because in reality and within all that can be measured, everything happens for a reason], then we would have chosen our parents for particular reasons. As it is our parents who initially begin to equip us, we may have chosen them for what it is that they could equip us with and if so, this smacks of life purpose and of possible chosen roles.

As an experiment, draw up a list of the fundamental personality traits [both positive and negative] that you see in both of your parents [individually] and then see how many you have in common with the positive traits. Ask yourself, "*Why would I have wanted musical strengths?*" [for example]. Ask yourself this question about all of the positive traits that you identify as having in common with each of your parents and then ask yourself "*What could a person like this want to achieve?*" Consider the things that you are most passionate about and enjoy doing the most and see what you FEEL.

Look at the list of your parent's negative traits and see how many of these you don't share with them. You may find that you don't share many [if any] of their negative traits, where some may find that they are literal carbon copies of their parents.

If we agree to adopt and to live a life that we co-create, view and know of but have not yet experienced, this would mean that at some level or from a certain perception, everything that happens in our lives is already known - including any 'negative' events or choices made on the way that could change the life we initially co-created and

chose. When we perceive ourselves as being a victim, it is only from our current human earthly perspective that we may see ourselves as such. This is because the 'villain' may simply be just a fellow soul playing a role and, as we all have free will, this must have been agreed between all relevant parties at some point before or even after birth. It is because we have free will that we can change our original life-path as we are experiencing and living it and this is how and why fate exists alongside choice, implying that all life is a combination of free will and fate.

If it is that all of the choices that we make during our lives are exactly that of a life that we have seen beforehand, this still suggests that we do know of our life but have just not experienced it and, also that maybe we don't change anything when we adopt and live the life from when we saw it before life? Either way, both theories suggest that everything that happens in life is in some way and on some level, supposed to happen.

Reincarnation gives us the opportunity to experience a life that we know of but have not as yet experienced and this allows for further learning, growth, evolution and knowledge of the self and experience of its expression and this in turn enables God to evolve because, we are God and God is us.

The victims and villains and anyone else who has a fundamental role in our lives are our soul mates and if we are all from God and therefore all connected, then are we not all soul mates the world-over?

Through years of observation and experimentation, I have discovered that the meaning of most people's names seems to relate to their personality and, that this then relates to their role, purpose and passions and, I do not for a second believe that any of this is coincidence. Maybe [as I believe] it is us who selects our names before we are born? I believe that when we're in the womb, we telepathically pass this name on to our parents and they then return it to us at birth. After we are born, the name that we choose for ourselves and its associated meanings can serve as a reminder to us of who we are and what our life purpose may involve [why we chose this life].

If you consider the meaning of your name [in accordance with your heritage/blood line] while looking at the list of positive traits that you made of each of your parents while also considering your passions, you will have something that can go some way towards showing you why you may have chosen the life that you now inhabit.

While there is every such thing as probability, coincidences simply don't exist because everything happens for a reason – even down to the selection of your name.

People who have a fundamental impact upon our own path may have agreed to do so because before taking up the life path that you chose, other souls may have also seen what you saw at this time and agreed to meet with you to fulfil a specific purpose or role in your life at a certain time. These people would have been in acceptance of you and your life and intentions otherwise they would not have accepted their role in your life and, this would mean that they are in acceptance of all of your past and future 'mistakes' as well because they have seen them before meeting with you - it is a point of reassurance that they meet with you.

Whilst some say that deja vu is a mental process that revolves around subconscious and automated mental prediction, I believe that it is actually a moment when we are re-remembering seeing a particular moment in our lives before we were born, just before it happens in our current life. Further to this, I believe that this serves as a function to try to wake us up to the concept of reincarnation and its related theories. If others and yourself have seen your entire life before you chose to adopt it, this implies that you and them would also know something of your potential futures.

Entities that claim to be spirit guides may sometimes not be what they say they are.

They may tell you that they know your life path and therefore your future and that they therefore know what is best for you but even if they do know of such things, how do you know if this is a genuine spirit guide or another type of entity simply hiding its true orientation?

If you're assessing the nature of an entity by how you physically perceive it [if you can actually see it], then be aware that you could be setting yourself-up to be fooled in the easiest way known to meddling entities; telepathic projection.

Through telepathic projection, some entities can read from our mind field - an ethereal aspect that surrounds us and that interfaces with the brain and that holds all of our thoughts in a form that is visible to some entities and humans who can see it. They can see how we believe certain entities would physically look and through this, an entity can appear to you in a way that enables it to pretend to be something that it isn't.

For example; if you believe that a spirit guide would look like an Indian chief or a witch, a negative-oriented entity could see this and can then shape-shift into an Indian chief or a witch. If you believe that a negative entity would look nasty, dark or negative, then it can try to shape-shift into something more pleasing and into something more in accordance with your beliefs of a positive, enlightened entity.

Angels use this process too but, purely and only as a means of helping us to recognise them. For example; if you believe that angels have halos and wings, then this is the form an angle will shift into because of course, not being physical entities, angels have neither halos or wings. If you instead believe angels to be like spheres of light, then you will see spheres of light.

In my experience, if you hold no specific beliefs about what any entity would physically look like then you are more likely to see nothing at all because, not having any beliefs about the physical orientation of any entity blocks meddling entities from messing. Put simply; being blind means that other senses are heightened and that you are more likely to be able to feel the true orientation of any entity and with regards to entity orientation detection, I believe that feeling is far stronger than seeing. However, despite holding no beliefs about physical appearance, I do still see things from time to time and so I do still have many questions about this issue and the mechanics involved.

I believe that an experience I had while editing this chapter can explain how this telepathic projection process works at a deeper and more intimate level with an entity of a positive orientation. I don't believe the timing was 'coincidental' and I instead believe that this experience was given to me so as to help me to explain this chapter better and, by using something a bit more fun.

I ran a bath and unusually, I added bubble bath - loads of it. Just after I got in, I was thinking about my guardian angel and was telling it how much I loved it and thanking it for its sacrifice in choosing me [I'm sure it could have had more fun elsewhere] and for being my friend and as I raised my hands out of the water, I noticed that the mass of bubbles in my hands formed the shape of a love heart. Feeling all loved-up [I'm very in love with my angel], I held the bubble heart in the air and gave it to my angel - telling it I loved it and was giving it this heart. It accepted my bubble heart and just then, I suddenly questioned if it was actually my angel giving the bubble heart to me via telepathic projection - not me giving the bubble heart to it.

It was just a mass of bubbles that I had subconsciously projected onto so that I could consciously see it as a love heart but, it was actually my angel who was influencing my mind to see the mass of bubbles as a love heart and that it was doing this as a gesture of love to *me*.

Basically, my angel friend beat me to it. Where I thought I was giving it something that I had made, it was actually my angel giving it to me [I got there in the end] by telepathically influencing my projections so that I saw the bubble heart. Without realising, I was giving the bubble heart to my angel when it was trying to give it to me! When I asked my angel for confirmation of the truth of which way around it was it remained silent but, it was its silence that influenced me to believe that I had felt the truth because angels are extremely humble and are used to their deeds not being recognised or being apportioned to other entities [such as God or arc angles] and, they never lie or mislead so when they get caught-out, they go silent until there's no point [only when I asked it if its silence meant something did it confirm to me that it was actually trying to give it to me].

There is one simple way by which we can all determine the nature of anything claiming to be any kind of guide and it applies to spirits, humans, psychics, mediums and entities of any orientation.

If an entity [of any orientation] truly is a guide, it will not EVER once tell you what choices to make because doing so would contradict your free will. They will not tell you what you 'need' to do or 'have' to do or 'should' do and will instead enlighten you as to what your choices may be and they may then enlighten you as to any potential outcomes but, they will never tell you what to choose because, not even God does this.

Therefore, any guide [physical or other] that tells you what to do with your choices is clearly working with you purely for its own interests and benefits and, your well-being and potential will suffer for as long as you give them the power of your choices and your future but, you will not see this until you attempt to take back their power over you and to break free of their influence and, it is only influence that they can ever have over you because it is you who has to make the final choices regarding any issue.

For example; some people say in law courts that "*The Devil told me to do it.*" when trying to justify committing a crime but, this is an excuse and a denial of personal responsibility because even if the 'Devil' told someone what to do, the person still has to make the choice to either do it or not. This is because nothing and no one can override your choice-making abilities [your freedom]. The ONLY thing that the 'Devil', God or anything or anyone else could ever do is influence you – not control you.

Despite this, law court judges will accept this excuse on the basis of mental insanity and, I have never come across a case where the judge accepted this excuse and then questioned why the person still chose to do what the 'Devil' had told them to do – and the judiciary is a responsible institution?

You can retake power from corrupt guides [physical or other] simply by not asking them of what you 'should' choose. Instead, ask them of what your choices are and of their potential outcomes only and then see what happens [if they're still around]!

A common trick of false guides is to tell you about your future – as if it was set in stone or as if you only had one potential future. Bit by bit, they will work away at your ability to make your own choices [to be free] and will never let you see the truth of your free will and through you, they will attack anyone who tries to show you this about them. Above all else, they will fight to ensure that you never see how all life occurs as a result of a combination of both free will and destiny.

Such entities are not 'evil'. They are simply lost discarnate energy entities that have fallen from dead humans and animals and so are trying to find a host. Some of them even believe themselves to be what they tell you they are and do not realise [they are not conscious or self-aware] that they are just a discarded emotional fragment in need

of recycling.

Some 'spirit guides' may not even be conscious that they are not even spirit guides and may truly believe themselves to be a guide, while others will be fully aware and will simply use your own energy and ego for their own purposes but, they are never 'evil' [there is no such thing] and are instead simply just lost and not aware. Treating such entities as if they are 'evil' [such as the religious do] will only serve to create more 'evil'.

The sad thing is that while so many people consciously [and therefore pro-actively] seek a spirit guide, they become open and vulnerable and risk falling for a discarnate entity that is merely pretending to be a guide and, they miss the one true guide who has been with them since before their birth and who has made an agreement with them through God, to escort them throughout their lives. What's more, the entire basis of this agreement entails this guide foregoing the right of free will and, they make this gesture with no conditions!

In my experience to date, angels are the only true form of spirit guide for humans. Without a single condition being requested, they make a choice to sacrifice a whole incarnation and, even if you forget that they exist and put a fake guide in its place for your entire life, this is okay with your guardian angel.

As with God, anything and everything you do or don't do throughout your entire life is okay by them because these things will be done or not done in accordance with your free will and it is the aspect of your free will that guardian angels are most concerned about and so as with God, guardian angels are only concerned with your well-being and are not concerned with your negative behaviour [they don't even see it to judge it in the first place].

On this basis, don't expect your guardian angel to make your choices for you or to interfere in the results of your own choices - even if to save your life [it is the religious 'angels' who interfere with free will] because unless you make choices to change it while alive, the time, place and method of your death was chosen by you before you were born and your guardian angel and God would have seen all of this.

When children talk of having an imaginary friend, they are not deluded, lying or ill. Children are naturally more open because religious doctrine and social conditioning has not yet polluted and restricted their minds. They are conscious of the relationship they have with an entity [of whatever form and orientation] and, assuming that such children are deluded, lying or ill or, are in contact with an 'evil' spirit is where adults go wrong and this can lead to potential alienation for the child and therefore increased vulnerability - especially if the child is consciously in contact with a discarnate entity as opposed to its guardian angel. Even if a discarnate entity, it will not be 'evil'.

I do not believe in the existence of the Arc angels and I instead believe that these are no more than religious inventions. I believe that those who believe that they are communicating with such entities are actually instead being served by their own guardian angel, other angels or both. Such is the nature of guardian angels, that they will only let you know if they're standing-in for another if and when actually asked. Due to what I believe about the mechanics of reincarnation and the principals of free will, I believe that all angels have lived multiple human incarnations as well as multiple angelic lives and I do not believe that Angel is a state of evolution that is 'above' human because with all entities involved in an on-going circular process, none are either behind or in front of another and, this is also why no human is either above or below another.

Re-cognising that the nature of 'evil' is simply human reactions to mismanaged emotional pain oriented in fear and guilt [and therefore that the 'Devil' is just a

metaphor and that 'Hell' is therefore a self-induced, self-created, guilt-influenced state of mind - experienced in accordance with free will], would enable us to grow-up a bit and, considering that what we call 'ghosts' and 'demons' may simply be discarnate fragments of human energy [as opposed to an actual soul] could also be beneficial.

How can we believe beyond uncertainty, that Mohammed wasn't taking doctrine from one of these lost fragments pretending [or even believing itself] to be the angel Gabriel? How would Mohammed himself have known even? It was Mohammed's wife who interpreted his experience in the cave for him and it was her who told him that the source of his 'divine' doctrine was the angel Gabriel - and she wasn't even with him at the time! After all, the books of all religions do state that God has needs and requirements of us, and this contradiction with logic in the Qur'an [for example] does indicate that the information from Mohammed's entity was not pure - but was corrupt. A God of love and peace who desires to punish when 'he' has no need to?

How can we believe beyond uncertainty, that Moses wasn't taking doctrine from one of these lost fragments pretending [or even believing itself] to be God? Christian history shows that the Bible is a compilation of edits taken from 87 different books. One of these was written by Mary Magdalene [who spent more time with Jesus than anyone else] and no aspects of her book were included in the compilation [edited by men]. Science has not found one artefact from over half a million people spending any time in the desert - let alone forty years and, Judaism still ignores the science that shows that the world has existed for longer than six thousand years.

Was Moses listening to the word of a God who has no needs and has given us free will or to his own will and inner fears when he created the Ten Commandments? How is it possible to disobey a God who has no rules? Did God give us free will or not? If God gave us free will then where do these rules, laws and so-called 'sins' come from? Free will is complete, not partial. How can something be given with both freedom and restrictions at the same time and be called 'free'?

Were both of these men [if Moses even existed at all] exploited by such entities because they were so passionate about bringing peace? Could this passion have made them vulnerable if they were not fully aware of the source of their doctrine? God's love is not conditional - it is free.

Up to the age of seven, I had a lot of resentment towards 'God'. It culminated in me regularly swearing at God for "*sending me back to this fucking place!*" I was so angry with God for sending me back, yet no one had ever told me that I had returned. I had no idea of reincarnation but I knew that I hated God for sending me back to Earth and I spent much time letting 'him' know of this and, this may have been around the time that my mother thought that I was possessed.

One day, after some very intense moments sticking two fingers up to God and telling 'him' what a fuck 'he' was, it suddenly occurred to me that God may not have sent me back and that I may have actually chosen to come back. As I thought about this, I started to question why I would have possibly chosen this. I was so unhappy and quite isolated at this age but, over the following two years the anger turned to questioning and subsequently, the questions have searched-out answers.

I have since believed that I chose to adopt this life [incarnation] and for me [and I believe for all humans], it was to experience expression and joy, to learn and to grow, and to fulfil my chosen purpose. For me, to find my purpose I look to what I enjoy and what I am most passionate about. I see many and I see that some purposes are purely for my enjoyment and myself, while others involve serving something other than just myself [directly]. I believe that this is true for all humans but, I do not believe that there are any obligations other than those which we place upon ourselves because God has no needs and we have free will.

Further to this, I believe that God would not ever 'call' humans to a particular vocation and this is because for God to do this, God would be demonstrating the requirement for God to satisfy a need but, God can not have any needs because God existed before everything and so is invulnerable. I believe that those who say that they were "*called by God*" to perform a specific task or vocation have simply not recognised that it was either their imagination or an unidentified entity that they were listening to. When humans are so ready to accept without question, that anything that speaks to them must be God or a good-natured spirit guide, it is no wonder that so many are so easily fooled by their own self-created, ego-hungry delusions.

I have previously mentioned of how George Bush had publicly stated that 'God' had told him to attack Iraq and, I have also stated all of the reasons for why a God with no needs would not call for such behaviour against other humans. I therefore believe that George Bush provides an excellent example of this type of ego-driven, "*I'm so special*" self-delusion.

Regarding specific learning experiences that may seem coincidental, do you notice that the more you judge someone of a specific expression or behaviour, the more chance you have of encountering an experience that puts you in his or her place? This is a place where you experience why that person may have behaved in the way that you judged and you get there by judging the behaviour of another with prolonged intensity. Your psyche is actually questioning it and wanting to know about it and as you have free will, it is likely that what you question or think of in this way will at some point be given to you because you are literally asking for it but, without consciously realising that this is happening.

Through such experiences, you will likely come to understand that if you were in the shoes of another, you probably would have made the same choices as them and if not, you will at least have an understanding of why they made such choices.

However, when we start to question a form of behaviour or attitude without judging another personally and without any intensity, we are more likely to just receive the knowledge and are less likely to actually have to go through an experience that would give us this knowledge and this is because in this circumstance, the actual experience would have less purpose and benefit. Observing or questioning something is not the same as passing judgement and condemning something.

When we are consciously with God but not earthly, this may be in a moment of tangible reality and facts outside of our individual human perception. These facts may be what some refer to as the laws of the spiritual realm but, they are not laws. They are natural processes and principals [misinterpreted] that occur outside of our immediate human influence and defined only by the behaviour and nature of nature - including God and us.

If we could be in our heaven with God and we knew that we could be on Earth and still be with God, wouldn't we use our free will to choose to return from time to time - even if it was just for fun? In this sense, God is a process of which we are all an on-going part of. Living is God being God and us living is us living as part of God. When God is being God, God is living, is loving, is life, and so God is love and life and, life and love is God.

This means that our planet may be a lot more important to us than we currently realise and if we continue to abuse it as merely a testing ground for our moral and religious codes of conduct and religious point-scoring, it won't be sustaining human life for much longer. Life/God/love will continue and so too will the planet - after it's wiped us off so as to protect itself - and maybe not for the first time?

Life and God will continue - just without humans.

How and why the future is up to us - not the prophets of Doom

If we as a global culture believe in a biblical catastrophic return of the Christ, then let's just keep imagining it - millions of people all on one planet thinking about the same vision all at the same time is the one sure way to make it happen and it's happening right now but, there is no apparent return of the Christ.

There is though the children rising up against their parents [driven by resentment caused by neglect], the seas swallowing up the land [again], the winds blowing harsher and colder [again], uprisings against the 'non-believers', uprisings against those of the other religions [because all others are 'wrong' or demonic and the only way to God is through their religion], and virus and disease given to the 'sinners' from God and everything else interpreted from Revelations by the so-called 'scholars'.

If on the other hand, you see that God has no needs and that you have free will and that what happens on this planet is a result of human behaviour and natural phenomena, then maybe you would like to start believing in something different and a bit more positive and fun and a bit more in-line with what God and us may have intended for us?

Thoughts are energised and then they become part of what we call reality so, all of life is the result of thoughts energised and made real.

This is how and why it is that thoughts are literally creative and, how God is at the source and is aware of all other thoughts and, this could also be how we are aware of all thoughts too but just don't generally re-cognise this. This may also explain how telepathy and other natural information-communication processes work and this would mean that all psychic ability is a natural part of the connection process - not a tool of the 'Devil' or a 'gift' or 'special powers' for 'special' people.

As an experiment, gather a group of friends together around a jar of beans. Take note of everyone's guess as to the quantity of beans in the jar. Total-up everyone's guess and divide it by the number of people in the group [establishing the average guess]. After counting the beans, notice that as a collective, the group will have seemed to have known [to within a very close margin] the accurate quantity of beans in the jar.

Seeing our potential futures may be possible because if before birth we have seen our entire next life, then at some level within us there will be a memory and connection to this.

If some energy forms have density to some extent [so they can exist in physical form], and are connected to and are from thought energy, this could also explain some of the mechanics of what some call 'magic' and how humans are able to use it. The other aspects of 'working with magic' could simply involve deluded interaction with lost energy matter - not with 'ghosts' or complete spirits. This would mean that anything that happens on these levels could only happen with God and free will or with agreements of some kind because God is at the source of everything and so therefore, these energies could not ultimately be 'evil' and, all life itself is magic anyway.

If these connections exist, maybe what plays out in life all starts in our heads and so maybe the more positive our thoughts are, the less earthquakes we will have to endure and the less negative energy entities we have to clear and the more joy we can experience? By thinking more positively generally, our behaviour modifies and we therefore naturally become more protective and respectful of our planet and the natural environment anyway.

Science, history and psychology have now disproved most of the fundamental aspects

of religion. Through science and history, we can see that there was life on earth prior to four thousand BC - contradicting the entire basis of the Jewish faith. We now believe that Moses didn't take half a million people to live in the Egyptian desert for forty years or for any amount of time. We believe that salt water doesn't mix with fresh water when rivers converge with the sea because of geographical factors, not because Allah keeps them separate [as Qur'anic science still foolishly teaches UK children today]. Science and religion can never converge because all religion is fiction and so, they will contradict each other more and more as scientific practices develop.

It is science and spiritual awareness that are converging, not science and religion because through time, science continues to disprove more and more aspects of religion and it will do so until religion is finished because, self-questioning is not occurring within the religions [it has been programmed out].

If you question my sanity then I reiterate that I have already chosen to be examined [at a forensic level] and that the results confirm that I have never suffered from any psychiatric disorders. If you think that I am deluded with the theory of all of our problems being connected to the religious perception of God, then why is human life on the brink of extinction? If our laws are a derivative of our morals and our morals are derived from our perception of God and the world is about to wipe us clean off it [again], doesn't this show that the root cause of our self-destruction lies in how we perceive God and the nature of God? If this is so and if this view doesn't change then neither will our future. We can choose to shift our outlook simply by being open to different ideas, or we can die like the stupid and selfish fear-driven sheeple that we currently are.

Unfortunately, religion is so selfish, corrupt and consuming that it also affects those who are not religious. With over two thousand years of established religion and with information from multiple 'prophets' going back thousands of years and, with most of the world's population following this doctrine, if it was all so 'right' and so true and such a 'good' life for all, then why do humans behave more destructively than they did before the establishment of these religions?

With direct democracy and with religion out of the way, we could choose to create Heaven on Earth with re-cognition of a God who has no needs and no desire to punish [or reward] and who is only love. Re-cognising that the nature of 'evil' is simply human reactions to mismanaged emotional pain, fear and guilt [and therefore that the 'Devil' is a just a metaphor and that 'Hell' is therefore a self-induced, self-created, guilt-influenced state of mind - experienced in accordance with free will], would enable us to grow-up a bit and, considering that what we call 'ghosts' and 'demons' may simply be discarnate fragments of post-death human and animal energy [as opposed to an actual soul] could also be beneficial.

After all, we all have the gift of free will and God has no needs and so God is not punishing us - we are!